

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAY 20 1952

FINE ARTS
READING ROOM

C

A

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

J

**SPRING
1952**

volume XI, Number 3

Editor: LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER, Cleveland Institute of
11441 Juniper Rd., Cleveland 6, Ohio. *Editor for Book Reviews:*
ALLEN S. WELLER, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. *New Editor:*
VIRGINIA WORLEY, 312-318 Genesee St., Utica 4, N.Y.

THE COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is published quarterly by the College
Art Association of America at 625 Madison Ave., New York
N.Y. Two dollars a year; single nos. fifty cents. Entered as second
class matter at the Post Office in New York, N.Y., under the
act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Menasha, Wis. Printed
U.S.A.

College Art Journal

CONTENTS

PAGE

Modern Art and 'The Criticism of Love' (<i>Joseph C. Sloane</i>)	160
A Balanced Art Department (<i>Stephen C. Pepper</i>)	166
Relation of Creative Design to an Education in the Humanities (<i>Peppino Mangravite</i>)	172
The Search of Man for His Lost Soul (<i>William Kolodney</i>)	177
The Artist and the Liberal Arts (<i>Ralph L. Wickiser</i>)	180
Modern and Traditional Ways of Teaching Painting, I (<i>Robert Jay Wolff</i>)	182
Modern and Traditional Ways of Teaching Painting, II (<i>Leon Kroll</i>)	185
Art Illustrations in Text-Books (<i>Kathi Meyer-Baer</i>)	188
The Transfer of Residual Works of Art from Munich to Austria (<i>Ardelia R. Hall</i>)	192
Art in Springfield (<i>Mary Blair Cochran</i>)	194
Contributors	196
Minutes of the 40th Annual Business Meeting	197
News Reports	202
Letters to the Editor	212
Book Reviews	214
Books Received	224

Editor: LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER, Cleveland Institute of Art,
11441 Juniper Rd., Cleveland 6, Ohio. *Editor for Book Reviews:*
ALLEN S. WELLER, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. *News Editor:*
VIRGINIA WORLEY, 312-318 Genesee St., Utica 4, N.Y.

THE COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is published quarterly by the College
Art Association of America at 625 Madison Ave., New York 22,
N.Y. Two dollars a year; single nos. fifty cents. Entered as second-
class matter at the Post Office in New York, N.Y., under the act
of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Menasha, Wis. Printed in
U.S.A.

College Art Journal

CONTENTS	PAGE
Modern Art and 'The Criticism of Love' (<i>Joseph C. Sloane</i>)	160
A Balanced Art Department (<i>Stephen C. Pepper</i>)	166
Relation of Creative Design to an Education in the Humanities (<i>Peppino Mangravite</i>)	172
The Search of Man for His Lost Soul (<i>William Kolodney</i>)	177
The Artist and the Liberal Arts (<i>Ralph L. Wickiser</i>)	180
Modern and Traditional Ways of Teaching Painting, I (<i>Robert Jay Wolff</i>)	182
Modern and Traditional Ways of Teaching Painting, II (<i>Leon Kroll</i>)	185
Art Illustrations in Text-Books (<i>Katbi Meyer-Baer</i>)	188
The Transfer of Residual Works of Art from Munich to Austria (<i>Ardelia R. Hall</i>)	192
Art in Springfield (<i>Mary Blair Cochran</i>)	194
Contributors	196
Minutes of the 40th Annual Business Meeting	197
News Reports	202
Letters to the Editor	212
Book Reviews	214
Books Received	224

N
-
127

MODERN ART AND 'THE CRITICISM OF LOVE'*

Joseph C. Sloane

"The only activity which can establish a *raison d'être* (for criticism) is love." E. M. FORSTER, *Two Cheers for Democracy*.

IN THESE days it would indeed be a hardy soul who professed to be able to solve the problems of the criticism of modern art. Yet possibly the time has come to ask certain questions concerning it whose answers may ultimately lead to a clearer idea of the true nature of painting during the last half century. Since it is the more advanced work which has called forth the greater amount of discussion, the emphasis here will be upon the writing concerned with it.

At the outset, we should observe that this avant-garde painting has today a large, articulate, and intelligent group of ardent supporters. In fact, in the field of informed professional interest, it may be said that this group is now the majority. Nevertheless, a considerable number of its members continue to speak and write as if they still represented a minority, and as if the art which they support was still struggling for a fair hearing. The critical chip which is thus carried on the shoulder not infrequently leads to what might be called a "total defense" of advanced art forms, a defense which regards any and all adverse criticism as heretical, and assigns traditional painting to the limbo of the outdated.

A critic who ventures to point out defects of any consequence, either in the work of important individuals or in the accepted criteria of the progressive position, lays himself open to the sharpest kind of opposition from a host of artists, writers, curators, and others who will not hear any ill spoken of the movement. Although much of what has been written in opposition to this art has been inept, inaccurate, and unsympathetic, well deserving of the unpleasant things said about it, it is, none the less legitimate to inquire whether the low calibre of this criticism is the result of the impossibility of really making important objections at all, or the inadequacy of those attempting to make them.

The adherents of modernism have been unusually quick and generous in awarding the cachet of greatness to the art of which they approve, apparently

* From a paper delivered at the College Art Association Conference held in New York in January, 1952.

believing that we are no longer subject to those errors of judgment which, only a few generations ago, applied this honor to all the wrong people. Strictly speaking, the mistake that was made was rather to claim that the wrong people were *good* artists—for it was frequently remarked that there was no great art to be found. Today, having pointed a just finger of scorn at the narrowness of academic taste, some of us have adopted a catholicity of approval which might seem too broad to be critically effective.

If past experience is to be relied upon at all, we can believe that in time, out of the very great amount of art produced in the last half century—an unusually prolific period—only a small percentage will survive, a prediction which would apply to the painting of the avant-garde as well as to more conservative forms. Even if all the latter be ruled out as clearly destined for oblivion, it would seem probable that the surviving examples would not be drawn from all the manifold directions with which we are familiar, but only from certain of them, the others proving for one reason or another so unfruitful as to have a final interest only for the scholars of the future. It is conceivable that this historical selection will never take place to the extent customary in the past, but this will occur only if society continues indefinitely to exhibit its present diversity of belief and lack of common direction. Ages of uncertainty have usually been succeeded by others of more universal conviction, a phenomenon which may be expected to recur.

If such an eventual choice is to be made, it would seem that once the new forms have been properly established, we should be at liberty to ask in all sincerity, and without the implication of philistinism, whether they have an equal merit, and, in a more historical vein, how they compare with the creations of previous epochs of our culture. No one, I think, would deny the right to ask the questions, but there are those who become somewhat heated at any suggestion that at least some of the answers might come out in the negative. Strong efforts have been made to condition us to the belief that all the art of the more famous moderns is good, and that the only problem is to go on to a choice as to what parts of it are better, and even great. But is this a true picture of the situation? To put it bluntly, is it really a fact that there are no bad paintings, no inferior artists to be found within the ranks of the well-known figures of the avant-garde? Possibly there are only a few who would care to go thus far, for if this is indeed the case, we are living in an age of an artistic magnitude unequalled in the past.

But if we suppose that some poor painting exists, even in high places, how do we set about finding it, so that it may be separated from that which truly deserves wholehearted approval? At this point the student of the matter may

well have trouble, for he will find a singular shortage of universally accepted standards to use, and might even find himself in disagreement with some of the few which have, at least, the support of the majority of the writers dealing with the problem. Within the field itself there is a wide diversity of principles, some of which, when carried to their logical conclusions, rule out other, opposed progressive forms, but there has been some reluctance to apply these exclusive theories generally, on the grounds that the whole movement should, to a considerable degree, stand united against the forces of reaction, forces which are often regarded as synonymous with those of any adverse judgment. It may turn out, in the end, that the clues to the proper choices we seek will be found in these same internal disputes, or it may happen that they will be found outside them altogether.

As mentioned earlier, it has been accepted as a truism that progressive painting needs defense, and this thought has colored much of what has been written about it. But defense of this sort is not objective, it is honestly biased and pays little heed to that function of criticism which is devoted to a weighing of good against bad, or fulfills it simply by assigning badness to all more conservative forms. Though it has had, and continues to have, very real value, it should not come to be regarded as the only form of analysis suitable for our time. Its origins go back at least a hundred years, to Zola the spokesman for Manet, to Vollard the champion of Cézanne, to Sérusier, the Steins, Kahnweiler, Apollinaire, and a brilliant group of others who fought the good fight for recognition to such effect that the battle was won at last, a resounding victory for the criticism of love. But now that this phase of the matter has, as it were, become history, there should be room for critical discussion of a different, and perhaps less heated sort. The recent exchange between Mr. Benton and Mr. Soby in the *Saturday Review* was certainly painful reading.

If tempers are still short, it can be blamed on the bitterness of the struggle which went on for so many decades, and the well known examples of injustice inflicted on the more original masters. The Impressionists and Post-Impressionists from the beginning were in competition with an entrenched conservatism which was producing an art unworthy of the influence it possessed. There is no question whatever that the Salon art of the late 19th century was bad, a travesty, in fact, upon the tradition which it professed to be continuing, but once this fact was generally proven, and an astonishing number of even the conservative critics were aware of it at the time, there is little gain in continuing to use it as a proof for the excellence of the advanced painting of our own day. If this latter art is excellent, it should be compared, not with obviously bad art, but with other excellent work, a comparison which

will make its virtues far more solidly apparent, and may help us with the thorny task of weeding out its flaws.

Our thinking has been further conditioned by the unhappy fate of those earlier critics who, at the time, were not wise enough to see which way the life in art was developing, or, analysing its movement correctly, still did not approve. Thoré, for example, understood Manet's style quite well and even the reasons for it, but was not on that account persuaded of the rightness of what the artist was doing. Today, rather than commit the sins of the 19th century writers, we may feel it a better policy to try to find the good in *all* new forms, encourage each talent, and refrain from adverse comment lest the future prove us wrong. If we are to be wrong, it is better to have been the artist's friend and err with him, than to have taken a stand against him and later be recorded as both mistaken and unfriendly. This is an understandable and praiseworthy attitude to adopt, but it should not be the only one available to us. As Gaunt has pointed out: "Since the time of Whistler's *Ten o'Clock Lecture*, few critics have ventured to state roundly that a picture was good or bad."

The fact is, a change has come over this profession in the last few generations. Formerly, writers discussing modern art—that is, contemporary art—believed that they had a share in saying what should and should not be done, while today there is a strong tendency to regard such ideas as presumptuous. Zola, an early critic of the new type, said that the work of tomorrow would not be that of today, that no rules could be formulated, no precepts given, all one could do was admire the artist's temperament and try to follow its expression in the work of art. In short, to use Forster's term, the modern critic's function is to love the art to which his attention is directed. If he does anything else, he ceases to be the artist's friend, and apparently loses the right to speak at all. His words are to be used to suggest something of the painter's purpose, to arouse an interest and a delight in what has been done, but if he uses them to maintain that in certain case the purpose may be unworthy or the effect faulty, then he will promptly be accused of talking about things he wots not of.

This, of course, raises the problem of who, if anyone, is competent to *talk* about art at all. The language of art is vastly different from that of literature, and it is well known that the effects of the one are often indescribable in the terms of the other. Furthermore, the more emphasis there is on the formal aspects of painting at the expense of subject matter, the less competence words seem to have in interpreting what is going on. Friendly as well as harsh words suffer alike from this defect, and it may well be, as has been sug-

gested, that we should stop writing and just look. Yet the habit of commentary is apparently too strong for this advice to be followed, and surely an insight into paintings can at times be gained by what others have written concerning their experience with them. It is fairly certain, then, that the critic will remain with us in the foreseeable future. But who shall be allowed to speak?

Some hold that only the artist has this right since he is the only one who really knows the creative experience. This oft-repeated statement implies that the observer, when he looks at art which he himself is incapable of creating, has no true notion of what has happened to produce the object of his interest or delight. He is no "mute, inglorious Milton," but a rank outsider. In this view, he is not even at liberty to say what *does* happen to him, what he does think, lest he be called to task for not accurately stating the artist's purpose. If the painter be the only proper critic, then we must look to him for whatever light can be shed not only on his own work, but that of other painters as well. But given his own strong expressive attitudes, will he be able to do justice to the opposed attitudes of another? Is it not desirable to have as many thoughtful opinions as possible from both creator and observer to the end that the best interests of the art world will eventually be served thereby? If there are to be critics to love and explain the painter, may there not also be critics to love and explain art in a larger framework, and even discuss what may appear to be its shortcomings? And what of the critic who creates pictures himself, even though not professionally? Does this help to give him the credentials he needs, or is his amateur status a handicap? Lastly, has the historian of art a competence by virtue of his acquaintance with what has happened in the past, or is he, as happened recently and in public, to be set down as little better than a parasite on the living tree of contemporary creativity? If he must leave "modern art" alone, where does "history" stop?

All these are difficult questions to answer, and they require, it would seem, as genuinely tolerant an attitude upon the part of all concerned as may be developed. Ignorant, bigoted, insensitive writing should very properly be condemned, but we must beware of applying such labels automatically to opinions with which we are not in agreement. Under the leadership of the criticism of love any censure of one member tends to be regarded as a blow at the entire movement—except, perhaps, among the members themselves, where differences are freely stated and answered—but in such an atmosphere any valuable outside contributions to the question of value judgments become far less likely.

It may be that this somewhat exclusive situation has arisen from an attempt

to persuade *everyone* that *only* the modes of avant-garde creativity have any importance for our time, that only revolutionary attitudes toward form, content, expression and representation are admissible in the new world around us. In order to do this, it has been obviously necessary to overcome the uninformed prejudices of the artistically illiterate sections of the public, but it has also been thought necessary to clear away obstacles raised by another, far smaller group of persons who are quite well informed about matters pertaining to the arts, as well as to history, philosophy, literature, and other aspects of our culture; persons who, in spite of what can surely be called a developed understanding, find these new tenets difficult or even impossible to accept, or if acceptable, only so to a limited degree. In some other age more convinced than ours that the past is importantly connected with the present, it might not be felt so necessary to make even this group agree on the merits of our originality. They might, in such an age, be regarded more in the light of "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition," a group which, while differing from the majority at important points, would still hold an honorable place because, although their differences stemmed from another view of the direction which should be taken, they loved the cause of art as well as their opponents.

Life for such persons is not too easy today, and their worries are increased by the intimation on the part of the more extreme adherents of the avant-garde position that a real affection for, and consequently insight into, such art is not possible unless one *lives* more or less along certain lines which extend out from it. As was recently pointed out, to live in a truly modern house requires one to get rid of any Sheraton pieces hitherto enjoyed. Unless one is ready to renounce more of one's ties with the past than affect painting alone, a conflict may well develop between a pleasure in the new and a persistent affection for other aspects of the spiritual life derived from what Robert Motherwell has alluded to as "the vicious past."

This possibility should not be dismissed as a mere flippancy, because a deep affection for progressive art may require very real sacrifices which, if not made, lead to dissatisfaction with both present and past, and if made, can well result in a feeling of insecurity as to just what sort of person one really is. All of which is to say that the problems raised by modern art are so serious and fundamental that the choice made concerning them, whether individual or collective, should not be made lightly or irreverently. Only if a taste for art is a superficial aspect of life, a mere fashion, can its sweeping implications be adopted easily, and no true admirer of it would want it accepted on such terms. Such ideas, for instance, as the notion of the work of art as a thing-in-itself without moral reference, or the belief that the subconscious is the seat of

genius, or that the only absolute remaining in the world is that of a force of dynamic change largely derived from modern physics—these and similar concepts put forward as bases for creativity have a significance which goes deeper than preference, deeper than fashion, to the very center of man's ideas about himself, and so, therefore, does the art which embodies them. Since some of these theories and expressions, operating on levels of fundamental relevance, are in sharp opposition to others, the necessity for selection among them cannot be evaded. The artist may well be something of a seer as history shows, but we are faced today with seriously divergent prophecies leading to ends of very different sorts, each of which, if accepted, has far-reaching significance for human life. The individual, if he wishes, can make—as he has been making—decisions valid only for himself, but it seems probable that society as a whole will soon have to pick the hopes, the solutions, the attitudes which will redeem it, and produce larger areas of agreement among the inhabitants of a rapidly shrinking planet. This will, presumably, be as true in the field of art as it will be elsewhere. In the picking, we will need all the sage advice we can get, and from as many quarters as possible.

A BALANCED ART DEPARTMENT

Stephen C. Pepper

THE *Problem of Introducing Art into the American University*. A little over a dozen years ago the University of California Art Department at Berkeley was given the opportunity to work out with a rather free hand an art curriculum suitable for a liberal arts college. The plan has now been in operation long enough to warrant a retrospective estimate of its worth. This paper is accordingly in the nature of a report on the success of the plan for the benefit of other departments similarly placed.

The problem was envisaged as that of bringing the essential values of the visual arts effectively into a liberal education. This was seen as part of a larger plan including music, drama, and literature for bringing back those aesthetic and cultural values which were almost lost in our colleges by the gradual disappearance of Latin and Greek.

The Idea of the Balanced Department. In terms of instruction, the visual art field naturally divided into three areas: 1) practice; 2) theory; 3) history. Most colleges in the '20's and '30's stressed either practice or history. The

professional art school was the model for the one and the traditional history department for the other. The emphasis on practice generally prevailed west of the Alleghenies, that on history along the Atlantic seaboard. Each tended to monopolize art instruction in the college where it got rooted, and to disparage its rival. An unfortunate conflict thus developed between practice and history in college art circles, which is only now beginning to be abated, largely perhaps as a result of the spread of the policy of the balanced curriculum such as emerged in Berkeley and independently at about the same time in a number of other universities which were facing the problem.

Dispassionately viewed, it seemed evident that both practice and history were essential to an intimate and well rounded acquaintance with visual art values. By practice a student finds out how an artist operates and something of the way in which he imaginatively thinks. Through history he acquires breadth and background. But also theory is needed for a systematic understanding of aesthetic values and critical judgment. Theory and criticism somehow got rather thoroughly neglected during the controversial era of college art education. It was felt at Berkeley that all three areas should be equally represented. From this conviction it was but a short step to the conception of a balanced department.

The Three Majors in Art. The curriculum was divided into three groups corresponding to the three main interests in visual art. It was expected that a student would show a preference for one or another of these groups. So three distinct majors were provided for, depending on the student's bent. But whatever the area of emphasis, the student was required to take a good proportion of his work in the other two unemphasized areas. (Actually, however, up to this time, only the practice and history majors are in full operation.) Moreover, since a prerequisite to graduate studies at Berkeley is the fulfillment of one of these majors, it means that no student obtains a higher degree in practice without a good grounding in history and theory, nor does any student get a higher degree in history of art who has not handled a brush and had a fair amount of practice. This seems like simple good sense, and yet until the advent of the balanced curriculum in the American University, it was rare that a student was required to have both history and practice in his art education.

The aim in these majors is not for an evenly divided knowledge of the three areas, but to let a student specialize along his natural bent with, however, an adequate ballast in the areas outside his specialization. This was thought a better policy for insuring a relatively deep and discriminating understanding of the cultural values involved than an attempt to keep each area about equally

emphasized. Particularly for graduate students, this policy has important implications. The desire here is to provide for the training of men of the highest quality in their special area of art interest. If the interest is too scattered, the quality, it is believed, tends to become adulterated.

The Higher Degrees in History of Art. In accordance with the natural extension of work for gifted students after graduation from a liberal arts department, provision was early made for an M.A. either in the history of art or in the practice of art. More recently the department has added provision for a Ph.D. in the history of art.

The requirements for this doctor's degree follow the traditional pattern. The total area of art history is divided into five fields: primitive, oriental, ancient western, medieval western, and modern. A student in addition to the elementary survey courses, and specialized course work in various periods, is required to pass a qualifying examination in three of the above fields, in one of which he is expected to write a thesis exhibiting a piece of historical research of some originality.

The culmination of the history wing of the department in these fields of specialization sets the requirements for the men needed in the history of art staff. These must be men of scholarly competence and, so far as possible, of distinction in these various special fields. At least five men as authorities in their respective fields are needed. And really more than that. The oriental art field is much too extensive for a single man. And the modern field is so much in demand by candidates for the degree that one man would not be enough to handle it even if he could claim some competence over all the periods since 1400 A.D. The present aim of the department is for five men—and this does not include coverage of primitive art, for which it is often possible to find somebody with competence in the Anthropology Department. We think this represents the very minimum staff for graduate offerings in the history of art.

No Ph.D. in the Practice of Art. But in the practice of art the department at Berkeley definitely does not offer a Ph.D., and has consistently tried to persuade other universities of standing to maintain the same policy. This policy directly follows from the principle of taking creative ability seriously as on a level with scholarly ability. The requirements for advanced work in practice meriting an M.A. are flexible enough to do no harm to a creative artist. But a set of rigorous requirements for creative work comparable to those in the history of art or in other scholarly domains would almost inevitably lead to an extreme academism. Yet, if rules regarding what shall be required of an artist in his creative work are relaxed to give scope for his originality, and as a substitute a certain amount of history is added, the result is likely to be a mediocre artist and an adulterated historian.

Moreover, the only reason for a Ph.D. in the practice of art is pressure from the administrative officers of smaller colleges and normal schools who desire the security a higher degree seems to guarantee them of the competence of the man they appoint, and perhaps also the glitter of some capital letters in a catalogue. But actually in this instance a Ph.D. is almost a sign of lack of distinction. For artists with a strong creative desire have more important things to do than consider the demands and criticisms of a doctoral committee. A Ph.D. is no indication of an artist's achievement, and it is far better not to give such a degree than allow the impression to get around that it signifies something it cannot possibly mean. A Ph.D. in the history of art signifies genuine scholarly competence. A Ph.D. in the practice of art could not possibly be brought to have a comparable significance. It is more likely to signify the opposite. So, the Berkeley department is proud of its record in holding out against the pressures to institute such a degree, and in possibly persuading other universities by its example to resist the pressures also. By this means, paradoxically, the standards of creative ability can be kept much higher in the staff and in the instruction of a college art department.

No Academic Degrees Required of Practice Art Instructors. Not only is the Ph.D. not granted nor required of practice art instructors, but neither is any other degree required of them. The aim was to obtain the ablest possible instruction in both the practice and history fields. Highly trained scholars who had acquired a Ph.D. or equivalent were obviously the group from whom to recruit the best competence in the historical field. What would correspond to this group in the creative field? Clearly, the successful or highly promising creative artists who also showed teaching ability. But these men often had no academic degrees whatever! One of the recent triumphs of liberal education in America is the widespread acceptance today of the creative artist without an academic degree as a member of a college faculty on a par with the scholar carrying a doctor's degree. At Berkeley the principle of outstanding creative work counting equally with scholarly research for appointments and promotions in any fine arts department has become firmly established. For instance, of the ten artists on the regular staff of the Berkeley Art Department today, only four have an M.A. The other six have not even an A.B. Contrary to many doubts a decade ago, these men have fitted into the academic family perfectly well and are a source of cultural enrichment.

The principle of the equality of creative and research ability in the University is one requiring constant vigilance, however. A new committee on promotions or a new administrator may have to be shown its importance all over again at any time—in spite of its being printed in the instructions. But it works much for the best. The requirement of an academic degree for an

instructor in any phase of creative art unduly restricts the area of choice. Such degrees signify nothing as regards the creative achievement of the man. If a college seriously wants the best artists it can get as teachers, it will place no irrelevant restrictions on the area of eligibility. The willingness of an institution to appoint a man of ability without an academic degree is almost a sign of how seriously it values quality of creative achievement in the arts.

Pyramidal Structure of Courses for History of Art; Fan-shaped Structure for Practice. One of the most successful innovations in the Art Department was the reflection of differences of subject matter in the difference of organization of courses for the history and the practice of art. The traditional pyramidal structure of university courses in terms of subject matter and prerequisites was obviously appropriate for the history of art. By this I refer to the practice of identifying a course with a determinate subject, and having more elementary courses in that subject prerequisite to more advanced courses. The natural determination of a historical subject is in terms of a cultural area and chronological periods within that area. On the whole this policy of covering the history field has been followed in the department. The aim has been to cover the various cultural areas and periods with specialists competent in these fields.

Formerly the practice field was conceived on the same pyramidal analogy. But it resulted in a highly artificial classification of courses. Practice courses were distinguished in terms of techniques—water color, oil, tempera—or in terms of subjects represented—landscape, life, still life, portrait—or in terms of some theoretical concern—design, perspective, anatomy. On the view that the most important function of a practice course is to give the student some understanding of the creative activity of the artist in the production of a work of art, this department asked itself what was the most direct way of attaining this end. The conclusion was that after a certain minimum of elementary instruction in basic principles of pictorial composition the most important thing was to bring the student into contact with a number of genuinely talented artists, and that it made little difference what subjects or techniques the artists used but that the individual aims and styles of the artists made the essential difference.

When this principle was embodied in a curriculum, it meant abandoning the customary pyramidal conception of courses and substituting a fanlike structure. Accordingly, after two elementary courses on basic principles, all courses in art practice were spread out in a row and given the same name, "Advanced Drawing and Painting," and were distinguished from one another only by the name of the artist instructor. Theoretically, the artist was at liberty to do any-

thing he wanted in his course. Actually, in mutual consultation, thought is given to some distribution of techniques and subject so that every artist will not be doing by accident the same sort of thing. What is stressed is the individuality of the artist's approach. And this principle is what tends to determine the selection of men appointed in the practice division. Men with as different styles as possible are sought so long as they also have definite creative talent and promise of distinction.

Students majoring in practice are required to take courses with at least three different instructors. Beyond this restriction, students may repeat one of these advanced courses with credit as long as they can profit from the criticism of the instructor. By this means, the department hoped to break up tendencies toward copying and proselytism, and to encourage a sense of the justifiability of a number of different ways of creating a picture.

Success of the Plan. This structure of courses has proved remarkably successful. Primarily the department had in mind the ideals of a liberal education, to give students as full an understanding of the values of art as possible in the time allotted. The attention was always focused on the values, what made a picture satisfying. The virtuoso attitude never had soil to start in. But, even though we were primarily considering the cultural development of the undergraduate, it has given us great satisfaction to discover that the more talented students who went on for graduate work in creative art have proved as good or better than those trained in the professional art schools, and compete with them successfully in local and national exhibitions. It is possible that a liberal arts background makes for a professional artist of higher caliber than the comparable product of the professional schools in spite of the much longer hours of practice customary at such schools.

With the recognition of the three main functions of art education in a liberal arts college—history, theory, and practice—and a policy of adjusting the structure of courses, the selection of men, and the offering of degrees earned so as to conform to these functions, the Department in Berkeley believes that it has developed a departmental organization that can be relied upon for the purposes of a liberal education. It should be added that the department has been favored with a highly cooperative administration. In carrying out its policies, it has rarely met other than budgetary restrictions, which would have to be met under any conditions. The experiment seems to be working out as expected. It has fostered understanding between artist and historian, has to a considerable degree fused the values of the two approaches in the students' minds, and has made for a more balanced education than was formerly possible.

RELATION OF CREATIVE DESIGN TO AN EDUCATION IN THE HUMANITIES

Peppino Mangravite

IN THE language of collegiate education there is a phrase that is usually accorded as much reverence as the blessed word Mesopotamia. The phrase is: the Liberal Arts. But what is intended by the phrase varies with who uses it. To most people the Liberal Arts are merely that phase of higher learning which has no immediate practical utility. In scholastic circles the Liberal Arts are a diverse number of academic subjects to be taught only through the written and the spoken word. Other matters, requiring the development of the imagination and the practice of the creative act, are not "academic." They are not to be included in the Liberal Arts and are therefore no part of the humanities. When the visual arts appear in the traditional four-year Liberal Arts program, it is in courses on the history of art; and the medium of these courses is the written and spoken word, never the practice or application of the arts considered. In the average four-year Liberal Arts college the practice of Creative Design, for instance, is not looked on as "academic": it is a training in manual dexterity that has no place amongst the humanities.

Even in the dictionary definition the Liberal Arts are a rather fluid term. According to Webster they are "the Higher Arts which, among the Romans, only freemen were permitted to pursue. In the Middle Ages, they were the seven branches of learning—grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. In modern times the Liberal Arts include the Sciences, Philosophy, History, etc. which compose the course of academical or collegiate education."

Evidently, since the Romans, the higher arts have undergone changes both in subject-matter and classification. The mediaeval trivium has passed over into language and philosophy, while the quadrivium has almost wholly disappeared into the sciences, some of which are no longer thought of as

NOTE: This and the following paper by William Kolodney were presented at the conference in ART AND LIBERAL EDUCATION at Bard College, July 14, 1951. The conference was scheduled through the joint sponsorship of the Association of American Colleges, Artists Equity, the College Art Association, and Bard College.

"liberal". As our knowledge has been extended and re-classified, the Liberal Arts have taken new positions and relationships in the different perspectives opened out to us.

That these positions and relationships are not commonly agreed on is plain to anybody who knows current scholastic discussion. For many college administrators the Liberal Arts college is no place to teach the practice of the visual arts. An education in the humanities, in their opinion, can properly confine itself to history and theory so far as the visual arts are concerned. This notion determines the art curricula in many of our colleges, where the visual arts are approached solely as a source of historical record and where teachers abstract from works of art for the pupils' attention only what is relevant to some theory of historical development. The consequences of this are sadly evident amongst many college-trained men and women, whose approach to all art is abstractive and detached and who are unable to find in painting and sculpture the concrete experiences through which the artist communicates the variety and the depth of his insight into the human condition.

I am of course not implying that it is a mistake to teach the history of art. The history of art is necessary even to the "appreciation" of art; it sets the individual artist in the context in which his full stature can be understood. Art *is*, among other things, an historical record, with its own special revelations of this or that period of history. In what it has to tell of the thoughts and feeling men have entertained in the past the history of art has its place both in the study of philosophy and of history in its broadest sense. To the extent that it helps toward an understanding of the fundamental motives of art and in so far as it makes plain the intent and achievement of the individual artist, the history of art can be closely integrated with the practice courses.

Art is a visual statement, and visual statements cannot be wholly grasped in the single aspect of historical phenomena. The fact that a truth is often best understood in the act of speaking or writing is a pedagogical commonplace. Similarly the experience of giving an idea visual manifestation through shape, space, color, and texture provides the student with a command over the idea and its potentialities that is not to be had from intellectual contemplation alone. Emotion and thought are combined in practice to make a sum of personal understanding that cannot be had solely from historical interpretation.

Basing its thought on this fact, the School of Painting and Sculpture at Columbia University has initiated a series of courses in creative design as a required part of education, and has these courses taught by artist-educators acquainted with both the technical processes of the arts and contemporary psychology. The aim of the series is cumulatively to present to the student a

vision of creative design through analysis and practice. In this way his ability to acquire knowledge through the eye and by practice is heightened and expanded. Knowledge of the arts is then not had alone from concepts, but also from developed and practical abilities. With a trained eye and an experimental knowledge of artistic creation, it hardly needs saying that the student will have a deepened comprehension of the problems and significance of art, which he will have studied by all the means available, rather than by only one—the word. Teaching is a business of communication, and such courses add seeing and doing to the means of communication. The result is not only an increase in pedagogical thoroughness, but also a better preparation of the student for a society in which the arts, rightly or wrongly understood, have such a vital part.

The "fine" arts have, of course, always had wide practical consequences in the societies in which they were practiced, but recent surveys in the United States seem to show that there is a greater popular interest in art than at any time since the Middle Ages, when, before the printing press and widespread literacy, painting and sculpture had a didactic function on the popular level. The current interest in art is reflected in our mass-circulation periodicals, in the increased use of pictorial symbols by business and industry, in the rapid increase in museum attendance, in the use by advertisers, textile manufacturers, and commercial designers of pictorial devices recently used only by the most "advanced" artists, and by the widespread aiming of art at a mass audience hitherto thought to be unresponsive to it. The didactic potentials of art in this situation are very great and present a challenge of guidance that our educational system must be prepared to meet. Education in the arts has its immediate practical aims.

In arriving at these aims it will be necessary to provide young men and women of college caliber with ways of knowing the substance upon which art theory is founded. Their knowledge will be worth little if it cannot contribute to their own and others' better living. It will be worth much if the average college student is prepared to exercise the taste that his superior intelligence manifests and that his training should inculcate. The formation of this taste seems more assured by some practice in creative design than by any other means.

During the middle school years, when the intellectual and imaginative faculties are nascent and receptive, thinking and doing are inseparable operations for the student. From this period on in the teaching of creative design there should be the same growing continuity of precept and application that is used in the teaching of, say, languages. Surely no one would contend that a

language should be studied only in its formal rules and its historical development, yet the study of art in many colleges offers something that is nearly parallel to this—or to the study of arithmetic without its use for adding up one's pocket money. Thinking and doing are as inseparable in the understanding of art as are study and debate in the development of logical thought. Our outworn system of college art education has assumed a distinction between these complementary elements of learning. The result, as exemplified by most college graduates, is an indictment of that system. Today the average college sophomore has the knowledge of design and standards of artistic taste of an eighth-grade pupil. He has been given little opportunity to improve on the notions acquired at that age. As sources of knowledge and experience, his art courses, if he has had any, have not kept pace with his growing sensibilities. Scholastically, they have been far behind his academic subjects.

If visual methods of education have increasingly shown their value in teaching subjects that are not primarily dependent on the visual faculty, certainly the same methods are worth much wider use in teaching the arts, where the eye is supreme. And with this new attitude toward the visual as a means of communication, the pictorial arts assume a new importance—or perhaps merely regain an old one. They are ready to serve the needs of the great influx of students who, since the close of the second World War, have shown a desire to be trained and educated as creative human beings, roundly developed in all their faculties.

The Faculty of Philosophy of Columbia University in a Report of the Appraisal Committee recently wrote: "The war experience of these students has taught them many things, but none more important for the future of society than their discovery of the importance of *values*. Living in other countries with other cultures—simple or complex—they have come to realize the dangers of provincialism. They wanted to be educated to learn the languages that unlock the doors to other cultures than their own. They have learned that there is a provincialism of time as well as place: they know that they cannot understand the culture of the present without knowledge of the past."

"At the close of the second World War . . . the common belief was that the greatest pressure on education would be for courses in science and technology." In some colleges the Liberal Arts programs were making room for science courses. In other institutions of higher learning the faculties of philosophy, art, and science were redefining the humanities. The Harvard Report declares that "because the arts wear the warmth and color of the sensibilities they are the most educative forces." Today everywhere in responsible institutions of learning one senses a genuine effort on the part of academic leaders

to relate the arts of making and doing to an education in the humanities. They understand that design in art means organization and construction of feelings and ideas into visual forms. Their mistrust of what they used to label "professional" is on the wane. They are coming to realize, as the Faculty of Philosophy of Columbia University well expresses it, that as "custodians of nearly four thousand years of culture, we must transmit that culture on as no dead thing but as a clue to the present and to the future. We teach the literature, the art, the music of the remote and the immediate past and of the present. In philosophy, religion, and the arts we pass on to still another generation the heritage of the best that men have thought and said and felt, in order that that generation in turn may base its thinking on human problems that have proved eternal. Such study involves knowledge, but we hope and believe that it also implies wisdom and understanding and sensitivity to values, moral and aesthetic."

"These students have learned that the bases upon which civilized life is built are less scientific than ethical and aesthetic, that the incentives to great human action are found not in machines, but in art and music and literature and philosophy and religion. They believe that, as has been wisely said, civilization is organized self-restraint, and that such restraint is a product of emotional maturity. Maturity implies the establishment of a more and more complex set of human relationships, increasingly fuller development of human understanding and sympathy. The faculty most important for such growth is imagination, through which man comes sympathetically to understand and appreciate other men and other cultures different from his own."

That is an admirable estimation of the humanities. It implies that the Liberal Arts to be really educative must do more than direct the student toward "the love of wisdom as leading to the search of it"; they must also at once enkindle and restrain the imagination and give the impulses and the discipline that makes possible the communication of the creative act; they must release the potency that passes over into the significant and self-sustaining act, the work of art. The "human problems that have proved eternal" demand a language of equivalent universality, and it is to be found in the enduring visual language that is drawing and painting.

It has been argued against the teaching of the Liberal Arts that they are remote ways of thought, perfected in a sort of academic cloister, not related to the world into which in time the student must venture. The fine arts, too, are not "practical", but they cannot exist without eyes that are trained for sharp attention to that very real world which is immediately around us, and the whole of education rests on a belief in a discipline that adjusts men to

reality although it cannot justify itself instantly in any terms of material profit and loss.

It should not be difficult to convince our academic colleagues that courses in the practice of creative design are not to be judged as "professional" in the pejorative sense but as a legitimate part of a Liberal Arts program. Does the mistrust of such courses derive from the notion that they prepare toward a narrow and specialized profession? That narrowness is found only in the limited historical approach to the arts. The course in the arts that includes practice must of its nature aim at sharpening the sensibility and unsealing the springs of creative activity, and, once these things are accomplished, the total person is a better agent for any purpose, even though that purpose has no apparently immediate relationship to the fine arts. Creative design is in the province of man's ancient search for knowledge: it rests on general principles; it seeks the facts, it inquires after the causes, and it attempts to promulgate the laws of the visible universe. As well as with the external world, it deals with the interior one, and its practitioner must in the creative act exercise critical judgment and guide himself by self-analysis. It calls for the individual use of reason, the observation of scientific principle, and the self-restraint that is basic to both achievement and morality. These are the characteristics of the free man and the essence of the Liberal Arts.

THE SEARCH OF MAN FOR HIS LOST SOUL

William Kolodney

THE most impressive thing about this Conference (at Bard College on July 14, 1951) was the spirit of affirmation that pervaded the discussions at the meetings and on the campus. In the face of the most convincing documentation that this scientific and money-centered age has created a *golem* that will destroy man's soul—if it has not already done so—the artists assembled at this Conference expressed a faith whose only equivalent can be found in traditional religion.

This faith was shown primarily in three ways: 1. The belief that every person can create a thing of beauty that gives dignity to his existence. The highest reaches of the imagination are possible, both to the amateur and to

the professional. Here, the amateur can find the perfection denied him in the finished object. It is the process, not the product, which enriches his life. It is for this reason that art education has something vital to say to every student whose basic concern is with the liberal arts. 2. The belief that Art and Life are organically related; they do not go their parallel ways—one to the ivory tower and the other to the marketplace. "When art is degraded, life is degraded." (Mumford) 3. The belief that art can give meaning to existence, indeed, that existence *can* have no meaning without art. "Art concentrates on the single experience which is never repeated." "Art transcends the limits of human intelligence." "Art is a way of knowledge; it is the intuitive approach to the essence of things." 4. And finally, the most remarkable expression of faith in an age when Genocide is a familiar concept, and the world has already forgotten the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto—the faith that art can humanize man. "Art is essentially a manifestation of love." The greatest enemy of all education is intolerance. "Art must have humanistic content."

And now, I should like to add a fifth way in which faith in the power of the imagination can operate: and that is the belief that art can make man's essential loneliness bearable. So much emphasis has been placed on socializing the individual, that not enough attention has been paid to his private life. Each person lives in a world of his own, made up out of those elements of the culture into which he is born, to be sure, but to which he responds differently from all others. This difference is his individuality. In that sense, he is alone in the universe. His world is made up out of those influences to which he responds most intensely. This may explain why compulsory courses in literature and in the arts have so little effect on the lives of the millions of college graduates. These courses have not touched their private lives. They have not prepared them for an age in which the death of a world is a subject of daily conversation. To persons of education and sensitivity, anxiety is born not only out of the sense of physical insecurity but as a result of a purposeless existence.

Yet every age is an age of anxiety. It is not true that our age is unique in this respect, but whereas the cultivated man of the middle ages was universally concerned about his soul, the cultivated man of today, regardless of his profession of faith, is more concerned about life on this earth.

This age, however, is unique in another sense. Leisure time, at least in this country, has become a burden rather than a blessing, and weighs heavily upon the conscience and patience of free men.

The story of modern man's attempt to fill this vacuum is familiar; a tremendous proportion of America's wealth in money, in labor and in mate-

rials is spent on narcotizing man's mind against time. Only an infinitesimal portion of the vast entertainment industry is designed to stimulate the mind and refine the emotions. The individual is not involved in all his capacities. He is "worked" upon by the most subtle instruments of diversion. The aim is to shock a person into attention, rather than to excite him to new wonder, to create desires which can never be fulfilled—for fame, for uncommon beauty, for wealth—to create the illusion that power over gadgets is power over nature. Man, whom religion enthroned over all the other creatures and whom science put in his place, tries to regain the importance which religion gave him, through material possession, at the expense of poverty of the soul.

It is to this central problem of our time—indeed of all time, the search of man for his lost soul—that the liberal arts should devote themselves. It is central to this age, not only because previous civilizations have offered religion as an answer to the meaning of existence but because the spread of higher education in the western world and the increase of leisure time gave men the tools with which to reason and more time to think. In the absence of a theology or a myth, existence can be made meaningful through the memories of which our private worlds are made up. They are the memories which remain with us to the end of our days. If they are great memories, they give dignity to existence. Such, for example, are the ideas which we get from a study of the classics of literature and of art. Such too are the ideational patterns which we get from a study of philosophy and history.

Even if there are no scientific or moral certitudes as there seem to have been in a previous age, even if there are no absolute truths and no final answers to the meaning of existence, the hunger for beauty and for truth is enduring. It is in this area that the liberal arts can meet most effectively the need of every individual to live in a world of his own making.

THE ARTIST AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

Ralph L. Wickiser

IN RETROSPECT, the Bard College Conference on the place of art in the Liberal Arts College seems a step in the right direction for both the practicing artist and the educator. Emotional prejudice, misunderstanding and fear between them will not disappear unless it is brought out into the light of free discussion.

The artist is new in academic life. He feels self-conscious among people whose only means of expression are words. And so at Bard College many of us tried to put our convictions into words. But the premise does not hold if both parties do not agree upon it; *the premise* that the practice of art, history, theory and criticism are inseparably contingent in life—only the classrooms and conferences split the art experience into independent categories. And so, at Bard College we talked *about* each other and not *to* each other. Another fallacious premise is perpetrated here. It is assumed that historians must talk to each other, painters must talk to those interested in the practice of painting. Categories are heaped on categories and "dilemma" stalks the corridors and classrooms.

I assume that the new importance of Fine Arts in liberal education has something to do with the practicing artist. This assumption should be made and clarified so that we will not continue to confuse the aims of professional art school teachers with the aims of the artist teaching in a liberal arts program. A discussion such as we had here yesterday concerning methods of teaching art in professional art schools and colleges should be prefaced by a statement of intention: what is the teacher trying to accomplish with the student as well as with the method.

Entering the academic halls presents many problems to the artist, most of which are foreign to his previous mode of living and thinking. He suddenly discovers that he is expected to translate into words his every action, idea and feeling. His imagery must be verbalized and systematized pedagogically because he deals with students, many of whom did not elect his course but needed the course to fulfill a curriculum requirement. What to do then with someone who lacks incentive to do or enjoy art. As an anticlimax, at the end

of the semester, the artist-teacher is asked to decide whether the young student in the art class is a low C— or a high D+.

In the classrooms, in the corridors and coffee shops the artist is asked to defend his theories of art and if he has not theorized he is forced to improvise in self-defense. His expression, which has been mainly intuitive runs head-on with the theory of ideas, rational thought and *logic*—that *stethoscope* of academic life. To create, to make concrete poetic and visual imagery, is no longer enough. The students, steeped in the precepts of intellectual inquiry force the artist constantly to externalize those thoughts, images and intuitions which had formerly been private. And so "talking about doing art" joins the disciplines of the hallowed halls of learning.

The artist, however, is not so much concerned with what art is *about* as he is with what art *is*. The aim of the liberal arts college is to foster inquiry into all fields of knowledge and *knowledge*, to most educators is verbal learning. It seeks to humanize the student through discipline in its subject matter. Art thus becomes another instrument for social adjustment in terms of democratic ideals. The concern of the artist-teacher in a liberal arts college is, then, how to effect a compromise with this pedagogical system; how to preserve and foster the essence of the art act which is not verbal, and at the same time, fulfill the cultural obligation of socializing the student.

It seems to me that the artist is having a profound effect on education, especially in the liberal arts college. The old restricted concept of knowledge has been challenged and better thinkers are aware of its non-verbal aspects and the nature of art. Many people are seeking to discover its function in the historical development of ideas, trying to find a method of organizing its processes so that it will be effective in education, without loss of its identity.

The artist, too, has been affected by the college. Many have gone to college, figuratively, while they taught college. The educated artist, for better or worse, is apparently here to stay. The effect on art, too, is evident. The intellectual problem in art has been reestablished, thanks to Cezanne. Painting today, has no better justification for its existence than as a means of making visual the significant felt-ideas of our times. The interest today among painters in scientific rationalism and oriental mysticism indicates a concern with the relation of philosophical ideas to paint ideas.

What will the prototype we are creating in college art departments be like in the future, Who knows? I venture to guess that the art program in the liberal arts college will not replace the professional art school. There is a need for both because over-intellectualization can kill art as quickly as indifference to the part ideas play in art necessitates the search for form and meaning in which we are now engaged.

MODERN AND TRADITIONAL WAYS OF TEACHING PAINTING, I*

Robert Jay Wolff

WHATEVER else you may say about it, the stated title of our discussion this morning has an air of being very sure of itself. It tells us that there are traditional and modern ways of doing things and it implies that some of us are dedicated to one way and some to the other; that we each have definite reasons for being what we are and that these two sets of reasons are mutually exclusive; finally that there is a clear basis for rational debate.

To me the issues are not so easily defined. It was not so long ago that so-called modern and traditional art could each be ear-marked and confidently defended. It would be comforting today to still be able to take a solid stand for one concept or the other. But it seems that the power of the concept is gone and we are left defending not modes of art but the fact before art which is our unadorned existence.

We are here supposedly involved in a defense of what is known as either the traditional or the modern way of teaching painting. It could be a pleasant and enlightening discussion if we decided to limit ourselves to our reasons for the particular way we like to see things done or the particular results we look forward to appraising and enjoying. But if we shift our interest from the type of thing produced to the status of the life producing it, we are in a slightly different and perhaps more difficult area. If we were merely discussing painting as such it would be presumptuous to make this shift. For we would be saying to painters that we must first concern ourselves with their life struggle before we could respond to their painting. But we are not talking about painting but rather ways, if ways there are, of teaching it. The very presence of the teaching problem implies to me not a need that a preferred something be taught but rather that someone who is at the beginning of a process of growth wishes to grow and learn. In this situation there is no place for imposed standards or methods. And if the title of this symposium suggests that a traditional standard of achievement or a modern standard of

* From a symposium of the College Art Association Conference held in New York, January 24, 1952.

achievement, one or the other, can better meet this problem, then I am ready to leave the controversy behind and stick to the first fact, which is not art but the human being we are presuming to teach it to.

We painters who extend our personal, professional interests into the field of teaching are forced to choose between two roads. We either decide to impose our own hard-earned securities, even if ever so gently, on our students or we meet them as some of us approach each new painting—without prescribed pressures. It is difficult for me, and I do not imply that this should be universally so, it is difficult for me to maintain within myself the dominance of my subjective involvement in a certain stream of painting over the overwhelming presence of a young human being who is reaching into the dark. I am too aware of the pitiful eagerness with which today, more than ever it seems, people reach for any prescription that will give the look that will effectively camouflage unfulfillment. The modern or traditional prescriptions, whatever they might be, are too easy, and being so are dangerous. I do not speak for my colleagues in the Design Department at Brooklyn College. For my part, I try never to give my students tasks or precepts or ways of doing that will make even more formidable the indigestible existences that will be forced on them when they leave me. It is easy to say that painting and art are a way of easing this situation, that here is the good life that modern existence has left behind. This thought gives me little comfort, for art, if its importance is intrinsic and not decorative, must be a positive force within the dilemma and not an antidote to make it bearable.

The fact of the matter is that as soon as we drop the idea that the teaching of painting is set up primarily to sanction the particular professional bias of particular professional painters—as soon as we drop this idea, we as teachers can turn our attention from the defense of our own way of painting to the basic needs of the student which may or may not have anything in common with it.

I know I will be asked that if this is so why is the workshop staff at Brooklyn College composed exclusively of men who are non-representational painters. It may be a coincidence and it may not be, but it is my experience that painters from this area are the only ones who, up till very recently, not only were ready but actually insisted upon leaving behind their own painting problem in order to face the new task on its own terms. I might add that it takes a very disciplined painter ego to transmit to students *only* the seeds of art, and to let them grow independently from there. This attitude does not produce types of painters or painting. What it does is to bring to life those forces which eventually make painting a necessary, self-propelled act. When

this happens it happens outside of the workshops. Our students who are painters paint at home and from within themselves and under their own auspices. When a student starts painting we automatically cease to be teachers. This mercifully lifts the question of modern or traditional art out of the unplowed field of learning and places it where it belongs—in the arena of professional accomplishment.

I may be wrong but to me it seems that the new generation of young people will not easily receive and absorb the full-grown fruits of art which we, their predecessors, may wish to hand down to them. I do not believe that they think of progress in the way we are accustomed to think of it. I do not believe they should be asked to look beyond their first need which is to find reality—and I mean reality and not a picture of it.

Before we can speak of ways of teaching painting we have the problem of bringing the senses back to life. We can ask ourselves, which comes first—the skill and cleverness to paint a creditable picture, modern or traditional, or the simple sensibility to feel what has been touched. Is the job one of building a communicating tunnel between distantly separated existences or one of establishing immediate mutuality between inner and outer realities? Is painting talking to each other or being with each other? Is painting you or is it I? Is it the mark I make or the mark you see? And who is primarily involved, the marker or the appraiser? Whose life is at stake, the creator's or the critic's, the student's or the teacher's? Is there a traditional form of survival and a modern one?

If we accept the fact that a young person turns to painting to strengthen his life and not to decorate it, we cannot expect him to accept a hand-me-down achievement, no matter how well packaged. He will learn that painting, like a thousand other human endeavors, is one way by which our thoroughly barricaded individual existences grow and find an identity with other growing things. At this point in human history, for one reason or another, we do not take much comfort in external symbols of mutuality. For the very means that are supposed to bring us close to the outside fact violently separate us from it. I stand here and there grows a tree. Will skillfully drawing its appearance bring me closer to it than the artlessly unqualified sight and touch of it?

The fact of the matter is that I am not concerned with teaching young people how to paint. But I am very interested in young painters. I believe we can give them ways and means, outside of instruction in easel painting, of sharpening and enriching their sensory intelligence, of strengthening themselves against incompatible acceptances and indigestible but socially rewarding pressures. We can give them the means of keeping themselves alive and fresh

and keen. We can give them the courage to find certitude in the unraveling of the here and now, in the touch of things, in their own reality and not in history's version of it. If we do this there will be more painting and less teaching of it and there will be no forums on how to teach painting. Perhaps we'll get back, after all, to not necessarily the traditional way of approaching painting but to an even older and certainly a more direct way—through life itself.

MODERN AND TRADITIONAL WAYS OF TEACHING PAINTING, II

Leon Kroll

THIS is not a challenge to those who oppose my point of view, because that is a privilege we all cherish. I simply wish to make a plea to you who teach the youth of our country to exercise greater tolerance toward and give more encouragement to those students who wish to discipline themselves and work to acquire a measure of universally understandable means in order to express in terms of art what they feel about life. To bear with and have a more sympathetic attitude toward those students who have the character not to be satisfied with vague abstractions which have become the vogue of the moment. Many young people are confused by the practically complete rejection of the image as a means of expression. The thinking student can find no precedent in the entire history of art to warrant such an idea. He is also confused by the injection of so many conflicting theories, each loudly proclaiming infallibility in a plethora of words of a mystifying nature. He is told that traditional art is passé and not of this epoch. That this is the mechanistic age, the atomic age, the age of political and social upheavals, etc. This seems, to say the least, far-fetched and silly to me. Let us examine tradition. In the best sense of the term, tradition in art comprises those works which have survived the experiments and pretentious claims of their own time to remain living in the present and a guide for the future. Great artists of the past were contributors and I believe that any living artist would feel honored to add the best of his effort to it. Creative people should not be guided by the desperate need to be original, which is so obvious in a number of artists today. The tragic result of this urge is a futile academism with more resemblances

than differences in the work produced. I don't see why anyone should worry or even think about being original. We are all original whether we intend to be or not, granted that we have integrity. One has only to look at the work of artists past and present, at least of those who have emerged, to recognize the differences, though no artist has ever appeared full grown upon the world without having been influenced by tradition in the creation of works of his own time. This is equally true of all the arts as of the sciences.

Those who have vision will realize that the "mechanistic age" of today, will, within less than half a century become merely quaint, whereas man and nature, ever recurrent, always new and wonderful, will inspire artists of the future as it has since time immemorial. I can see no point in de-humanizing art and in considering mechanical contrivances or transitory political and social changes, the spirit of our time. Some claim that art should express the stresses and strains of the atomic age, that art should be different in this age from anything that has ever been done, that it should be functional. A wordy manifesto gotten up by a few so-called advanced museums states that the (quote) "nude is out." This is very confusing. After all we were born nude. It is and always will be an ever-recurrent wonder and delight. The nude also has stresses and strains and is obviously functional.

All of this does not mean that I would eliminate experiment or question the right of an artist to explore anything he sincerely feels necessary for his development. But I do find that experiment is a means and not an end. Art has a certain fundamental aim, even from the earliest times. It has always been a striving to express the human spirit in human terms, based on a live observation of man and his environment. There has also been the urge to communicate the artist's vision of man and his aspirations to others. Anything that is not shared becomes ingrown and decadent. The combination of sufficiently recognizable representational forms and the artist's sensitivity to design and other pertinent considerations give us this wonderful and universal means of communication. The substitution of geometrical shapes or arbitrary abstract lines and planes as an end in itself, does not guarantee a so-called pure expression. All art that has integrity is pure anyway and there is no reason to believe that the more devoid a work is of human or naturalistic interest, the purer it is in a plastic sense. The artist never copies nature. That is obviously impossible. He makes selections out of nature to create what he feels about what he sees. Great art is beautifully balanced and is loved into being. It includes many elements eliminated by some obvious stylists of the moment we live in. Over-elimination succeeds only in producing something arid and academic. Instead of being austere or simple it is merely empty. No great artist ever

disregarded tradition. Authentic revolts occur in the effort to renew tradition and add to it. Revolutions in art are generally local, and when they abuse tradition are of short duration. Most of you who teach have integrity and humility, qualities essential to any kind of creative effort including teaching. You try to do the best you can. If I may make a practical suggestion, which I know has in a number of instances already been acted upon, I would have more practicing artists (those recognized by their fellow-artists) give criticism on occasion. I feel that too much authority and credence is given statements and precepts by professors, writers, critics and others who consider themselves superior to artists but who make a profession of concerning themselves with art without ever having painted a picture. This condition exists to a vastly greater extent in our profession than in any other. A touch of humility and integrity would make such people and those with whom they have contact much happier. If you must have words about art, I would recommend that you also give your students, to mention a few, the words of:

Piero della Francesca, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Rubens, Poussin, Ingres, Delacroix, Pissarro, Cezanne, Van Gogh, Gauguin, and others. I have spent many profitable hours in personal conversation with Maillol, Matisse and our own Homer. None of them had any idea of discarding tradition.

I would like to end my talk with a story Friesz told me when we were neighbors in the south of France. It was about himself and other *fauves*, the most revolutionary artists of their time. When they were young they all went to the Louvre in a body to see the great triumph of Manet the revolutionist over tradition in the form of Ingres. It was at the time Manet's "Olympia" was finally, after heated discussion, hung in the Louvre and placed to balance the "Odalisque" of Ingres. When these honest young painters saw the two pictures, there was silence instead of the jeers they had planned for Ingres. The truth dawned upon them. Both pictures were great.

ART ILLUSTRATIONS IN TEXT-BOOKS

Kathi Meyer-Baer

IDEAS vary as to the importance of understanding history, and what such understanding can contribute to education. In Europe that understanding is highly respected, perhaps too much so. In American education the value of history seems underestimated, especially by the students who object to learning about facts and things that have happened long ago.

It is not our purpose to discuss this problem here, but rather to point out the problems and difficulties that arise if once we have made up our mind to teach history, art or languages of older periods. If we start teaching such subjects in the first year of college, we generally are confronted with a complete blank, even in the knowledge of broadest sections of cultural history. In an interesting paper, "Seven Senses of a Room" (*Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, September, 1949) Katherine Gilbert described how she tried to overcome this problem in a very illuminating way. But this article shows the difficulties that arise because the college students are in no way prepared for an understanding of periods and styles of history. For children in Europe it is much easier to grasp the spirit of different styles, of Antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, etc., because there children grow up surrounded almost everywhere and daily by monuments of some kind, an old cathedral, a portal, or a castle. Such monuments, of course, do not exist in the United States with the exception of the treasures in the Museums, where, taken out of their natural surrounding and purpose, they always have a kind of artificial relationship to the student.

To ease the understanding of older periods the American textbooks have assumed the custom of adding illustrations, and that to a much wider extent than in Europe. This is an excellent idea, because the student will take to understanding rather subconsciously. The modern theories on the development of the mind have emphasized the importance of first impressions in the years of childhood and youth. We all remember the first time the spirit of some period was opened to us through some specific monument. Therefore the selection of the illustrations in the textbooks should be considered with the greatest responsibility. If illustrations are chosen which do not fit, or which are of bad taste, they will do more harm than good.

To clarify this one problem I want to analyze two textbooks of average standard—and they are not exceptions—where I disapprove of the choice of illustrations as confusing rather than helping the understanding. If more space were available I should like to have compared them with books in which the illustrations are of real help.

There is a Latin grammar book "Smith's First Year Latin" (copyright 1933, revised by Harold G. Thompson, publ. by Allyn and Bacon, 1947) in which the text is all right, but the illustrations! The introduction states the purpose of the illustrations: "Pictures, many of which are colored, give a Roman background. They show not only the ideas of famous artists but especially the grandeur of Rome's art and architecture. . . . Roman life and civilization are thoroughly treated in 30 inserted plates, each containing from one to four beautiful illustrations of the topic discussed." The book actually has about 200 pictures and if these pictures were well chosen and well reproduced, they might well illustrate "Roman life and civilization" to the ninth grader, but:

1. The quality of the reproductions is very poor and sometimes makes the recognition of the objects represented quite impossible, even for someone who knows the objects. To specify some items: in a reproduction of the temple of Jupiter at Baalbeck in Syria nothing can be recognized. A battle scene from the Trajan's column shows figures so small and indistinct that an unaccustomed eye cannot see anything but scribbled lines. The picture of the ruins of Troy is nothing but a black spot with a small tree on top.

2. The sources from which the illustrations are taken are sometimes outdated and incorrect. How confusing this can be is demonstrated by the illustrations of the Roman forum: One of them is explained as a picture of 1858, before the excavations started; two pictures exactly alike show the forum after "recent" excavations; but these recent excavations refer to the period of about 1912, and nothing is shown of the really "recent" finds. If the picture is to show the present day appearance, the photo has to be up to date, or it should indicate what year the picture was taken.

3. The captions under the illustrations should tell clearly what they represent, and to which century the painting or the sculpture belongs, and where it came from. Many illustrations mention the subject only, and no indication is given as to whether it is modern or antique, whether it is a painting or a mosaic, nor where the original is today. The captions are often incorrect. The picture on page 53 is not from the Trajan's column in honor of a victory over the Gauls, but from the Antoninus column in honor of a victory over the Germans. The captions need not carry shallow explanations

or false moral implications, as in the caption "Poena Gallorum non aequa est" under the scene just mentioned from the Antoninus column. The treatment of the vanquished should not be judged, but the customs stated and explained.

4. There are often too many illustrations for one topic. One well chosen, well reproduced and explained figure could teach more than a host of pointless ones. On the plate showing "Roman Lamps," we see five of them without anything being said concerning the use of oil or candles; nor is the typical small oil lamp, the *lucerna*, shown. If the author wanted to add scenes from fighting in the arena, he should have chosen the excellent reliefs from the Kircher Museum in Rome and the National Museum in Naples, which would have given clearer and better information about Roman ways than the items taken from modern movies and shown in this book.

5. But the chief reason for objection is that the pictures are taken from material that belongs to widely different periods, and in most cases nothing is said about the differences of periods and styles. To clarify this point I shall list some—and some only—of these grotesque illustrations. One plate shows the "school of Vestales" in a modern painting à la Hollywood, and directly above the antique sculptures of Zeus and Juno, all without any comment as to period or place of origin. A caption "Roman religion" is correct; but the figures do not correspond to the supplementary text. To illustrate the "puellae Romanae" we have beside a good Hellenistic original—no indication from when and from where—a painting in "new" style by Lord Leighton. For the "Roman women" we have two original sculptures beside a modern Hollywood-type painting.

Roman history is illustrated by the above mentioned original from the Antoninus column with indication of the wrong source, a second scene, "Mutius Scaevola" which is the picture by Rubens, a "Roman triumph" which is a colored plate from a painting by Kaulbach; and finally we have a colored plate "A Roman holiday with procession" after some second rate movie. The colored plates, intended to make special impression on the reader, are with few exceptions in the Hollywood style. Thus the child who looks at the pictures has to jump from one period to the other, from one style to the other, from originals to Victorian paintings or pictures from the movies. This book from which we have described these specific examples is no exception—we could have taken many more.

In a textbook for music courses, "Music the Universal Language" (ed. by Osbourne McConathy, Russel V. Morgan, George L. Lindsay, Alfred Howell, publ. by Silver Burdett Co. N.Y.), we find the same characteristics. Here

the problem is complicated, because the styles of the music examples as well as the picture illustrations are taken *ad libitum*. This particular book is divided into several units, some of which are good and bring music examples from the proper period, such as the troubadours and those of the Elizabethan time. But in the unit "Ancient sources of our music" we have as an item for Egyptian music (of which actually we know nothing) the "Consecration of Rhadames" from Verdi's *Aïda*; for Greek music, the first Pythic Ode arranged and harmonized, beside the Aria of Orpheus by Gluck. Other illustrations show modern figures in Egyptian, Greek and Byzantine dresses, as well as drawings after original Greek vases.

In the unit "Liturgical music" we find the 19th century Yom Kippur melody by Lewandowski and three original Gregorian melodies: the *tonus peregrinus* in a facsimile from a medieval manuscript, one melody of *Laudate pueri* and a *Kyrie Orbis factor*, from the 10th century, but the two latter harmonized! Then follow an Italian *Lauda* from 1545 and a *Gloria* by Palestrina, both listed as liturgical. Thus the reader is confused by melodies which may have originated in about the same period but are presented in arrangements from the 16th, 19th and 20th centuries.

The description of these two books—I repeat they are typical and no exceptions—may suffice. With the rich material of good editions and reproductions at our disposal it can not be difficult today to select proper illustrations.

To summarize, there are two chief points we have to protest. In the first place, the illustrations—pictures and music—in textbooks should be chosen from the period which they have to illustrate. These reproductions should be shown as clear and as original as possible; that means good copies, and for the music no arranging. Illustrations should be described in a clear and proper way, indicating the meaning of the content and the purpose—e.g. liturgical or secular—and giving the time and place of origin.

The second point is that all illustrations of really bad taste, Hollywood or Victorian, and the corresponding "romantic" arrangements of medieval music should be strictly excluded. Illustrations sinning against the first point will confuse the reader's taste; the illustrations sinning against the second point will spoil his taste. We have enough material today to be able to make the cultural background clear in a stimulating and interesting manner; this is true for pictures as well as for the musical pieces.

THE TRANSFER OF RESIDUAL WORKS OF ART FROM MUNICH TO AUSTRIA

Ardelia R. Hall

THE following statement by the Land Commissioner for Bavaria, Mr. Oron J. Hale, was issued on January 11, 1952 on the transfer of 967 residual works of art from the Munich Central Collecting Point to American control in Austria.

"The Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany states that after careful consideration and review of all the circumstances related to the disposition of certain works of art by the United States authorities in Bavaria, it has been decided that of the approximately 27,000 articles recovered by United States authorities from repositories in the American Zone of Austria and subsequently transferred to the Central Collecting Point in Munich for identification and appropriate disposition, 967 will be returned to the United States authorities in Austria to be held pending the establishment of satisfactory arrangements for further identification and just determination as to their ultimate disposition. This action is being taken strictly in accordance with commitments by the United States authorities in Germany to the United States officials in Austria, which were made at the time these properties were transferred to Munich and in accordance with a further commitment by the United States Government to the Austrian Government. The commitments in question provide that any of the transferred objects remaining unidentified as to proper ownership, upon completion of the activities of the United States Central Collecting Point at Munich, will be returned to the United States authorities in Austria. Since the United States authorities have recently terminated their activities at the Central Collecting Point in Munich, and since the proper owners of the 967 objects in question remain unidentified, these commitments are now operative."

The shipment of the 967 works of art from the Munich Central Collecting Point to the Neue Residenz in Salzburg took place on January 18 and 22, 1952, under the supervision of Mr. Edgar Breitenbach, Cultural Institutions Officer in the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany.

At the close of World War II, great stores of art were found by the United States Army in the war repositories in the American Zone of Austria. Among these repositories were those of the salt mines of Alt Aussee and Lauffen, on the opposite sides of the Steinberg Mountain. The State collections of Vienna were sent for safekeeping to the Lauffen mine and were returned to Vienna in 1945. The non-Austrian material from the Alt Aussee mines was assembled at the Munich Central Collecting Point. It included German State property, acquisitions of Hitler and other Nazi leaders, and the loot of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) from Nazi occupied countries. The transfer to Munich was made in order to ensure the preservation of the material and facilitate its identification. The Collecting Point in Munich had been established by the Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.) as the center of the cultural restitution program in the American Zone.

It is questionable whether without the painstaking efforts which were exerted by the American Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives officers and their German assistants, if so large a percentage of this restitutable property would have been identified and returned to the proper owners. An important contribution to the difficult and exacting task of identification was made during the past year by Professor S. Lane Faison, Jr., when he was director of the Munich Central Collecting Point. He brought to these complex problems his valuable experience as a former Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives officer and a member of the Art Looting Investigation Unit of the OSS. Of the 27,000 objects recovered in the Austrian repositories, approximately 13,000 were restored to claimant Allied governments; 8,500 were identified as belonging to private German owners and were returned to them; 3,600 were identified as Reich property and are now in the custody of the Federal Government. Only the 967 objects returned to Austria or 3½ percent of the total remain to be identified.

It is emphasized that the return of the residual 967 objects to the United States authorities in Austria does not in any way prejudice the question of the rightful ownership of these works of art and that the United States authorities in Austria will not effect further disposition thereof except on the basis of satisfactory arrangements in that regard, concerning which instructions will be issued by the Department of State in Washington.

Art experts have advised the United States High Commissioner that the more valuable pieces have been identified as to ownership. The remaining objects, although they are not without value and interest, are of secondary importance as works of art. The very fact that it has been impossible, thus far,

to trace the former ownership of these objects suggests their lesser value in most instances.

Reports of the recovery of a Monte Cassino altarpiece by Paolo de Matteis in Germany by Professor S. Lane Faison, Jr., Director of the Munich Central Collecting Point, appeared in the *New York Times*, December 15, 1951 and in *Time* magazine, December 24, 1951.

The altarpiece was restored to the Abbot of Monte Cassino by the Italian Government on February 6, 1952. The Italian officials again expressed the warmest gratitude for the assistance of the United States authorities in the recovery of this work of art.

ART IN SPRINGFIELD

Mary Blair Cochran

THE ever growing enthusiasm of the annual juried exhibitions in Springfield (Ohio) gives ample evidence of the way art is gradually taking root in America's multitude of small communities. This year's is the Seventh Show and opened Sunday, March 9, with a record attendance. Counters showed approximately one hundred visitors per hour. Community interest in art work is high and practically demands the continuance of this type of exhibit from year to year. Work drawn from a twenty-five mile radius is solicited as well as that of former residents, area unrestricted.

One special fortunately different characteristic marked this year's Show above all other things. A large number of the entries were from seasoned exhibitors. Most of the rejects were second or third entries of artists who had one or more accepted. Each artist may enter three pieces of work, any media. The disappointment, and the depressing aspect of reject day, was noticeably reduced.

Hundreds of dollars in prizes, mainly cash, all donated by local business and cultural leaders, offered to winners, attracted the best. Painful memory has eliminated, to a high degree, unsuitable entries. A popularity prize is awarded at the close of each Jury Show, so the public takes part in prize-giving. This feature pleases old and young. Children love to vote. Proximity of this city to Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton and Columbus Art Centers helps keep Springfield art-conscious, and the Association in touch with activities in the Middle West.

Featured in the show each year is the student exhibit, with its own prizes and its own jury. The student section of the show attracts youthful art enthusiasts who visit the exhibit in large numbers. It conditions young high school art students, and even junior-high art pupils advantageously in the experience of being accepted or rejected. Taking part, they learn at an early age the theory of jury shows, which is to choose and exhibit the best work entered.

Prize winners are rather consistently art instructors, but invariably one or two students will outclass their own instructors. The younger group this year took two while instructors took six of the eight prizes, or 25% youth, 75% professionals in the adult show. The two students are full-time art students.

Springfield Art Center in its first year of life has 150 students enrolled. Classes are taught, with a few exceptions, by instructors from neighboring colleges such as Wittenberg and Antioch Colleges. A sculpture student from the center won first prize over his teacher in this year's show. The teacher received a Merit Award. Incidents of this nature keep the field of competition fresher, out of a rut, and create suspense from year to year.

Human interest stories are not lacking. Mrs. Dora Horstman, 86, received a Merit Award for her oil painting, "Washday in Strausberg." It is among the five best oils, and was considered for first prize. Mrs. Horstman began painting at eighty years of age.

Of unusual interest in the sculpture section of the Seventh Annual Show, a piece called "Resurrected Christ" is attracting attention. Suggestive of ivy climbing a stone wall, the head of Christ is depicted in an outline of green plaster. Holes make eyes, a gap makes the forehead. The whole piece is set against a grey background of cardboard. Startling in effect, the piece has a fragmentary, sketchy aspect; the artist, a Prix de Rome prize winner some years back. Non-artist members of the Art Club Association can be helpful at show-time. They do clerical and desk work, and are not emotionally involved.

Palette-knife painting is becoming popular among the younger artists. Linoleum-block printing, wood-cuts, are coming from high school students. An expert teacher can get anything started. Many pupils may try a new medium, one or two pieces of show-quality may result. An inspired teacher can set many fires going and hereabouts he does. Silver jewelry, silkscreen prints and hand-weaving are in the crafts section of the present show. Pencil, charcoal, pen-and-ink, two color drawings in ink, and experiments with limited palette, and monotype are well received. Abstracts are prominent and interesting, but not dominant.

Extremely fortunate this year was the choice of a jury-of-selection. Intelligence, integrity, personal charm, were added to the technical skills of our jury members, namely, Kae Dorn Cass, of the Cleveland Institute of Art, E. W. Rannels, of the University of Kentucky College of Arts and Sciences, and Frank Rossi, Art Director of American Magazine. A this-is-good and this-is-bad attitude was replaced by their actually visualizing an art show and they produced a show that is interesting, exciting, colorful, alive, conversational, and altogether impressive.

CONTRIBUTORS:

Mary Blair Cochran is an author, book reviewer and literary critic in Springfield, Ohio. She is past President of the Springfield Writers' Club and was general chairman of the Annual Jury Shows of the Springfield Art Association during the past two years.

Ardelia R. Hall, formerly a research assistant at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and on the curatorial staff of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, has been the Arts and Monuments Officer of the Department of State since 1945.

William Kolodney, Ed.D. Teachers' College, Columbia University, is Director of the Educational Department of the YM-YWHA, Lexington Avenue at 92nd Street, New York City.

Leon Kroll was born Dec. 6th in New York City in 1884. Studied here and in Paris. He has won about 50 professional awards in painting including 1st Prize, Carnegie International, Pittsburgh. He is a member of the National Academy, the National Institute and American Academy of Arts and Letters, Chevalier of the Legion d' Honneur. He taught and lectured at various professional schools, universities and colleges and has more than 50 of his works in museums all over the country.

Peppino Mangravite, well known American painter whose work is represented in many museums has long been associated with progressive art education. He is the Head of the School of Painting and Sculpture of Columbia University.

Kathi Meyer-Baer, Ph.D., musicologist, was head of the Music Library Paul Hirsch in Frankfurt, Germany (1922-36); published many volumes on music. A survey of early music books, for which she obtained an A.A.U.W. fellowship, will be published by the Bibliographical Society, London. She is working on an iconographic study of the symbolic representations of music.

Stephen Pepper received his training at Harvard (Ph.D. in Philosophy, 1916), and taught at Wellesley from 1917-1918. He has taught at the University of California since 1919 and has been Chairman of the Art Department since 1938. His principal books are: *Aesthetic Quality*, *World Hypotheses*, *The Basis of Criticism in the Arts*, *A Digest of Purposive Values*, *Principles of Art Appreciation*.

Joseph C. Sloane is Professor of History of Art at Bryn Mawr College. His principal interest is in the painting of the 19th and 20th centuries, a field on which he has written several articles and a book, *French Painting Between the Past and the Present*.

Ralph L. Wickiser is a painter and Head of the Fine Arts Department at Louisiana State University. He is chairman of the Woodstock Artists Association for 1952 and author of "An Introduction to Art Activities." Currently he is painting and studying The Place of Art in the Liberal Arts College under a Ford Foundation grant.

Robert Wolff is a painter, author, and Chairman of the Department of Design at Brooklyn College.

MINUTES OF THE 40TH ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING, COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, HELD AT THE BARBIZON-PLAZA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 26, 1952

The President called the meeting to order at 9:15 A.M.

REPORT ON MATERIAL CONDITIONS

A. *Membership Report.* At the end of the year 1950 we had 1,992 members as compared with 2,034 members at the end of the year 1951. This is a net gain of 42 members in 1951 and for the first time the membership has passed the 2,000 mark.

B. *Finances.* (See consolidated statement on page 201).

C. *Financial Future.* The few larger institutions which gave larger subventions in the past are not able to give as much. The Board of Directors has taken steps to meet this by appealing to more smaller institutions for smaller subventions. This is our first objective for the new year.

D. *Office Expenses.* Office and miscellaneous expenses will increase as will publication expenses. The *Art Bulletin* was on an austerity budget during 1951 due to the special December 1950 issue dedicated to Professor Charles R. Morey. However, in the future there will be more promising aspects in that there will be more articles and illustrations in each issue.

E. *Reserve Fund.* \$1,000.00 of the surplus for the year 1951 has been put in the Reserve Fund which now totals \$13,500.00 and which is invested in securities providing a nest egg for the future.

The 1952 Financial Report may very well show a slight loss for various operating costs which may be greater than we anticipate. Also, as we cannot predict a sale of back issues of the *Art Bulletin* or a sale of books, a deficit may very well be shown. However, it has been agreed by the present Board of Directors that the slate of new officers is not to be held responsible for any action taken by the present Board during the past year.

LESSER ITEMS

UNESCO National Conference. The President made an announcement of the UNESCO National Conference which was to be held at Hunter College at the close of the College Art Association meeting. (See enclosed Program). An announcement was made regarding the International Congress of Fine Arts to be held in Venice in September, 1952, to which the United States is planning to send delegates from our Association, Artists Equity Association, etc. Mr. Rensselaer Lee is our official delegate with Mr. Sumner Crosby as alternative.

1953 Meeting. The Board of Directors has agreed to meet every third year in a mid-western city and next year's meeting will be held in Cleveland. The Local Committee consisted of Mr. Laurence Schmeckebier and Mr. Charles Parkhurst has already started on the preliminary plans for this meeting.

International Congress of the History of Art. To be held in Amsterdam, July 23 through 31, 1952. At last Thursday's meeting, Mr. W. G. Constable stressed the point that it is hoped that American art historians will play an important part in this Congress. All information such as papers to be read, who is to go, passage, etc., may be had from Mr. Millard Meiss whom the Officers of the College Art Association have appointed as Secretary to the National Committee. An Advisory Board will serve with this National Committee and details of the Congress will, we hope, be published in the next issue of the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL. All those interested in attending or participating can communicate with the National Committee.

Oath Resolution Made at the 1951 Meeting in Washington, D.C. The President brought up the question of the protest sent by the College Art Association as a result of last year's meeting in which it was requested that members not accept teaching positions in the State of California. A letter from Professor Pepper, who is Head of the Art Department at the University of California, outlined the situation in detail and how it has been corrected. Mr. Hope suggested that since the resolution has been accomplished, it is no longer binding (the Regents of the State of California have rescinded the Oath and the Supreme Court of the State of California has declared it unconstitutional) and that the College Art Association let the matter stand. Mr. Hope drew attention to the one important question concerning the Oath and its relation to the Association—should we retain the sense of the resolution which was that the Association discourage its members from accepting positions in the State of California? The letter from Professor Pepper implies that it would be a great help for the College Art Association to consider the prohibition voted upon in Washington be removed. A report from Mr. Frank Seiberling indicates that the people involved in the Oath situation have not been reinstated. In view of this fact, Mr. Hope resolved that the resolution remain standing. There being no objections from the floor, it was moved that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee. This was seconded with no discussion.

Refregier Resolution. Mr. Hope brought to the attention of the members the move headed by the American Legion in California to destroy a group of murals at the Wincon Annex Post Office in that State. A report from Professor Pepper states that these murals had been fully approved by the State and that any such move as this is unjustified. Mr. Hope suggested that the Association draw up a resolution concerning this move. Discussions from the floor involving the reason for the murals having been condemned revealed that the American Legion had detected some politically subversive material in the preliminary sketches. This questionable material was removed from the sketches and what was painted was then approved by the authorities. Mr. Lane Faison from the floor hoped that the College Art Association will be against this misguided patriotism. A motion was made that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee and was unanimously passed. Mr. Joseph Sloane made a motion that the College Art Association go on record as taking a dark view of this action.

Art Bulletin. Mr. Wolfgang Stechow, Editor in Chief of the *Art Bulletin*, extended thanks to the collaborators, Mrs. Lehmann who leaves as Book Review Editor and Miss Cutter, Managing Editor who is on a year's leave of absence. A welcome was extended to Mr. Horst Janson as the new Book Review Editor and to Miss Jean MacLachlan who is the new Managing Editor. Mr. Stechow reported that the economy measures taken during the year 1951 meant many hardships to the authors (reduction in the number of pages and illustrations). He also reported that there is a backlog of articles but extended a plea to the members who have written articles to send them in to prevent a shortage later on. The Editor reported that he hoped the waiting period for publication would not be too long and asked at the same time that the contributors read the *Notes to Contributors* in the March issue of the *Art Bulletin* with regard to requirements for submitting articles, to prevent extra expenditures. Mr. Stechow

also made a plea to the members connected with institutions to the effect that if they want material published, their institutions should, when possible, endeavor to make a contribution.

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL. Mr. Schmeckebier, the Editor of the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*, extended thanks to the members for their interest and support of the *JOURNAL* and acknowledged the generous help of Mr. Weller, Editor for Book Reviews, and Miss Worley, the News Editor. He made a plea for all members and institutions to take it upon themselves to get the news they want published to Miss Worley and in this way the value of the News Section could be determined. He stressed the importance of the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL* to people all over the world and their dependence on this publication as a means of submitting their views. The Editor announced that he would like to receive more criticism of the *JOURNAL*, more articles from those who are just beginning their careers rather than those who are already established, and a greater geographical distribution among the contributors. He also made mention of the new cover design and hoped that it would meet with the approval of the members.

Mr. Hope acknowledged and pointed out the great amount of work involved in the editing of both the *Art Bulletin* and the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL* and that no other member contributes as much to the growth and importance of the College Art Association as do the Editors. A rising vote of thanks was extended to the entire group of Editors for their work.

SHORT REPORTS

1. *Regional Societies.* Mr. Bier reported at last year's meeting in Washington the growing trend in the moving from East to West of the Regional Societies and also an expressed interest in their being related to the College Art Association through representatives. It was pointed out that the Regional Societies are moving to College Art Association type meetings and that more attention is being paid to the curriculum and to art educational programs. It was mentioned that any rivalry between the Regional Societies and the College Art Association in the past no longer exists and while the Regional Societies are anxious to maintain their autonomy, they want at the same time to be associated with the College Art Association. It was suggested by the Regional Representatives that the College Art Association consult with them in the future with regard to the prevention of an overlapping of interests since many of the subjects presented at the Regional Society meetings are discussed at greater length and in a more leisurely way. The President suggested that the various secretaries of the Regional Societies inform the Association of date of meetings and appoint a delegate to represent them at College Art Association meetings.

2. *Accreditation of Professional Art Schools and Related Schools.* It was pointed out that this complicated question of accreditation is a matter of concern to the College Art Association and it was agreed that some action should be taken to investigate the problem. Mr. Hope informed the members of the appointment of Mr. Lamar Dodd by the Board of Directors to study the question of accreditation as it affects the College Art Association. It was suggested from the floor that there should be an exchange of reports between the regional Societies and the National Association of the Schools of Design. The National Organization should appoint representatives to the Regional Societies to report on progress.

3. *American Council of Learned Societies Secretaries' Meeting.* Mr. Rensselaer Lee reported on the American Council of Learned Societies Secretaries' Meeting, which convenes every year in Rye, N.Y., and which is followed by a meeting of the delegates from each Society. Mr. Lee announced that a questionnaire had been circulated to conduct a national registration of everyone in the field of the social sciences and in the humanities. (It was pointed out that Mr. Charles Odgaard, the Director of the

American Council of Learned Societies, is eager to have everyone realize that the A.C.L.S. is cognizant of the role of the natural sciences.) A resolution was made at the Secretaries' Meeting that the study of the humanities is now more important than at any other time and that the A.C.L.S. is anxious to disseminate their ideas through various journals. Mention was made of the following services offered:

1. Technical aids to publications
2. Training opportunities for
 - a. faculty study fellowships
 - b. advanced graduate fellowships
 - c. public school teachers in the humanities
 - d. A.C.L.S. fellowships for displaced scholars
3. New fields of study
4. Demonstration of the utility of the humanities to our national welfare (See *Life* magazine for the Coming Congress.)

4. *Art Bulletin Index*. Mr. Hope pointed out the lag in the distribution of the *Art Bulletin Index* and asked that members acquaint their librarians with the existence of this *Index* and its price to members of \$12.00.

5. *Ratification of Acts of Board of Directors*. A motion was made to ratify the acts of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors during the year 1951, which were largely concerned with maintaining a sound financial condition.

The Officers of the College Art Association invited members to send in their comments on the meeting and thanks were extended to each of the Chairmen and to the Local Committee for their splendid work.

The President would like to receive the reaction of members to the pilot exhibition of students' paintings held at Hunter College during the meeting. It was suggested that the Cleveland Program Committee consider the idea for having a similar exhibition for the meeting at Cleveland.

NEW MATTERS

Mr. Faison moved that the Executive Committee write a short expression of devotion and approval of the work of Miss Ardelia Hall of the State Department, Division of Restoration of Monuments. It was pointed out that the program and the work would have collapsed had it not been for Miss Hall's untiring efforts.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS, DIRECTORS AND NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ballots were passed to elect Officers, Directors and the Nominating Committee. 76 votes and 283 proxies were cast and the following slate was elected:

Officers to serve for 1952: S. Lane Faison, Jr., President; John P. Coolidge, Vice-President; Mark Eisner, Treasurer; Roberta M. Alford, Secretary.

Directors to serve until 1956: H. Harvard Arnason, University of Minnesota; Franklin M. Biebel, The Frick Collection; S. Lane Faison, Jr., Williams College; Alden F. Megrew, University of Colorado; Millard Meiss, Columbia University.

Nominating Committee for 1953: George H. Hamilton, Yale University, Chairman; Justus Bier, University of Louisville; Sumner McK. Crosby, Yale University; Stephen C. Pepper, University of California; Frank Seiberling, Ohio State University.

The new Directors were introduced from the floor and the President called for a vote of thanks to retiring Directors. He extended a welcome to the new President, Mr. Faison, who announced a new contribution of \$100.00 to the *Art Bulletin* from Williams College.

Miss Luetz inquired if it was possible for an artist to be elected to the Board. Mr. Hope replied that any creative artist who is interested in teaching and in the

MINUTES OF ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING 201

affairs of the College Art Association is a candidate for election to the Board. He pointed out that Jean Charlot is on the Board and Lamar Dodd, who just retired from the Board, are both creative artists.

A rising vote of thanks and expression of appreciation was called for as President Hope stepped out of office.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

ATTENDANCE FIGURES FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE C.A.A., NEW YORK, JANUARY 24-26, 1952

Total registration	583*
Colleges, Universities and Art Schools represented	181
Museums and Galleries	68
Periodicals	6
Public Libraries	9
Foreign Institutions	4
Professional Art Organizations	19
Foundations	4
Miscellaneous	20
	<hr/>
	311

* It is estimated that at least 200 people did not register.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF INCOME, EXPENSES AND CAPITAL FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1951

Revenues

Memberships	\$17,606.51
Books for account of members	18,495.40
Sales: Miscellaneous	120.50
COLLEGE ART JOURNAL	1,578.78
Banquet and postage	1,083.73
Income Carnegie Corp. Trust Fund	550.00
University and Museum subventions	6,550.00*
Art Bulletin back issues	3,359.78
Art Bulletin Miscellaneous income	506.24
	<hr/>
Total Revenue	\$49,850.94

Expenses

Books for account of members	16,664.95
Art Bulletin printing, plates, etc.	13,622.90
COLLEGE ART JOURNAL printing, etc.	5,379.05
Salaries and commissions	7,117.05
Insurance and Annuity premiums	630.88
Annual and Board meetings	954.50
Miscellaneous: Banquet, overhead, promotion, postage & printing	4,206.45
	<hr/>
Total Expenses	\$48,575.78
	<hr/>
Excess of revenue over expenditures	1,275.16
Additions to Reserve Fund (income on securities, Life membership, etc.)	1,035.51

Capital January 1, 1951	21,527.50
Capital December 31, 1951	23,838.17
Accounts receivable	4,142.33
Accounts payable	1,032.87

* Carnegie Corporation, University of Chicago, Harvard University, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton University, New York University, Metropolitan Museum, Frick Collection, Kress Foundation, Yale University, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Columbia University, University of Michigan, Indiana University, Cleveland Museum, Wellesley College, Smith College, Morgan Library, Oberlin College, National Gallery of Art, Vassar College, Bryn Mawr College, William Rockhill Nelson Gallery, University of Louisville.

News Reports

ALABAMA

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

The Alabama Art in Cinema Society sponsored by the Art Department of the University is continuing its motion picture series. The society was organized a year ago to show foreign and domestic moving pictures that have been important historically and artistically.

ALABAMA COLLEGE

The Art Department has moved from Bloch Hall to Comer Hall where remodeling gives more adequate space for studios, offices, and exhibitions. The general color scheme is light gray with colors accenting some walls. Mr. Lewis Berry, recent graduate of the Art Institute, Chicago, is teaching crafts. Mr. Quinn Tyler, former instructor in the Art Department, is in the Army. Dr. John T. Caldwell, President, Alabama College, is a member of the Fine Arts Commission of the Association of American Colleges.

TROY STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Miss Martha Jane Ballard, who has been connected with the Art Department at Troy State Teachers College for eight-

een years, has accepted a position with the University of Florida at Gainesville. Her classes are being taught by Miss Jeanette Howard, a graduate of T.S.T.C., who has her Master's Degree from Columbia University, and has been engaged in commercial art in New York City.

JACKSONVILLE STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

A series of exhibits has been arranged by Dudley Hunt, of the Art Department. It is designed to present a general view of what is being accomplished by contemporary artists working in widely varying fields.

CALIFORNIA

MILLS COLLEGE

Dr. Alfred Neumeyer, professor of art history at Mills College has been invited by the Freie Universitaet Berlin to be guest professor for the Summer Semester, June 1 to the end of July. He will give courses on American art and the Art of The Renaissance. Dr. Neumeyer was formerly a member of the faculty of Berlin University. Antonio Prieto, Mills College ceramic artist, will represent the United States at a world conference of

pottery and weavers at Dartington Hall, Totnes, England, next July. The conference will be held under joint auspices of the Arts Council of Great Britain, the British Council, the British Ministry of Education and the Council of Industrial Design. Other Americans to whom invitations have been extended are Margaret Wildenhain of Guerneville and Langdon Warner of Harvard University. Bernard Leach, celebrated British potter, will preside over the conference.

COLORADO

DENVER ART MUSEUM

The Denver Art Museum announces the *58th Annual Exhibition for Western Artists*, opening June 2. This competitive juried show is open to all artists living in states west of the Mississippi plus Wisconsin and Illinois. Direct inquiries to Mrs. Otto Bach, 1343 Acoma Street, Denver, Colo.

CONNECTICUT

YALE UNIVERSITY

A group of Yale students, with an assist from the faculty, has banded together under the name of "Yale Art," and is holding exhibitions in a gallery established in Branford College, one of Yale's residential colleges. Patrick H. Clark, Jr., '53, of Washington, D.C., is chairman of the exhibitions and founder of "Yale Art." "Purpose of the group," Clark explains, "is to promote better understanding between the artists of the Yale community and their potentially large audience." All work in the exhibitions will be for sale with a \$20 ceiling on any one piece. Clark hopes to expand "Yale Art" to include other colleges in New England in a cooperative organization. Under such a plan the exhibits would be sent on tour to the other colleges. Advisers of "Yale Art" are George A. Kubler, Professor of the History of Art; George H. Hamilton, Associate Professor of the History of Art, and

Laurence Majewski, a graduate student in the Yale Department of Design.

FLORIDA

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Department of Art of the Florida State University sponsored its fifth annual Art Seminar in conjunction with the Ringling Museum of Art at Sarasota, April 6 through April 10, at the Ringling Museum. "Art and Society—Four Great Periods of Modern Life" was the theme. Visiting lecturers this year were Professor Millard Sheets, Head of the Department of Art at Scripps College, Claremont, California; Dr. Lester D. Longman, Head of the Department of Art at the State University of Iowa, at Iowa City; and Mr. Grose Evans, Docent and Lecturer at the National Gallery of Art at Washington, D.C. F.S.U. faculty members who participated in the Sarasota program were Dr. Edwin R. Walker, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Dr. Hale Smith, Head of the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology; Dr. Claude R. Flory, of the English Department; Dr. James V. McDonough and Professor Adolph Karl, both of the Department of Art.

HAWAII

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Max Ernst and Dorothea Tanning will be guest artists for the 1952 Summer Session, making their first appearances in university teaching. Mr. Ernst will give an illustrated lecture course. Miss Tanning (Mrs. Max Ernst) will give studio courses in figure drawing and in painting. An exhibition of their paintings is scheduled at the Honolulu Academy of Arts during the Summer Session, June 23 to August 1. Students of Tri-Alpha, University Art Club, are making lamp bases, hand woven shades, upholstery fabrics, wall hangings, flower containers, ash trays and a huge silk-screened drapery for the new Women's

Residence Hall. All of the items are correlated to the furnishings and utilize native fibers and glaze ingredients. The students are donating the proceeds to the purchase of a new 20 cubic foot kiln and additional looms for the department. The weaving is under the supervision of Miss Hester Robinson, the ceramic work directed by Mr. Claude Horan, with both students and faculty stimulated by the accomplishment of a large-scale professional design project. Ben Norris served as designer and coordinator for color and furnishing.

ILLINOIS

THE CHICAGO ART INSTITUTE

The Chicago Art Institute is sponsoring an International Exhibition of Contemporary Drawings. The purpose of the exhibition is to show a selection of about 250 contemporary drawings by artists from the United States and abroad. Entries are to be limited to work produced since the beginning of 1945. To give each artist adequate representation, two or three examples of his work will be shown. The exhibition's purpose is not only to be informative but also to offer an opportunity, mainly to participating museums, to purchase drawings from the exhibition for their collections. Prize awards will not be made. Deadline for entries is July 1, 1952.

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The Institute of Design of Illinois Institute of Technology announces a new graduate program leading to the degree of Master of Science in Art Education. Advisors for the graduate program in Art Education are Professors Hugo Weber and Peter Selz. For further information address the Director, Institute of Design, 632 N. Dearborn St., Chicago.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Chicago Campus

During the month of March "The Art

of the Poster" was shown in the University of Illinois Gallery on Navy Pier. Seventy-seven travel and industrial posters from fifteen countries were selected by Kenneth Shopen, in charge of art on the Chicago campus. He was assisted by Mr. Othon Goetz, Swiss vice-consul of Chicago. **Urbana Campus**—On view in the Architecture Building from March 2-April 3, was the annual "Contemporary American Painting" exhibition. An excellent catalog was printed containing illustrations of each of the 140 paintings in the exhibition. This exhibition was a feature of the *Festival of Contemporary Arts* which included three other art exhibitions—"Work of the University of Illinois Art Faculty," "Work of University of Illinois Art Students," and "Work of American Craftsmen"; craft demonstration-lectures by Bacia Stepner, Arthur J. Pulos, and Roy Ginstrom; and lectures and gallery talks by Lester Longman, Dwight Kirsch, George D. Stoddard, and Kurt Seligmann. Mr. Seligmann was guest of the University on the Carnegie Visiting Professorship Fund during the week of March 24-31. A conference on art education was held on March 15 with Josef Albers as speaker at the General Session. The entire *Festival* was under the Chairmanship of Rexford Newcomb, Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts.

INDIANA

INDIANAPOLIS

The John Herron Art School's guests on its visiting artists' program for this spring will include Stuart Davis, Walter Stuempfig, and Leon Kroll. In addition to the regular seminar and criticism periods with the regular students, each guest will speak on his own work to a specially invited group of local artists and art instructors. Garo Antreasian, graphic arts instructor at the school, took a purchase prize at the National Exhibition of Prints held recently at Bradley University.

KANSAS

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

An exhibition of paintings by artists from Kansas and the surrounding region is being held March 30 to April 20. The Jury for the show included Doel Reed, Head, Department of Art, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Okla.; H. Harvard Arnason, Chairman, Department of Art, University of Minnesota; and John F. Helm, Jr., Director, Friends of Art, Kansas State College. Purchase awards totaling fifteen hundred dollars have been made from recommendations of the Jury. Purchases will be added to the collection of the college.

LOUISIANA

LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY

The Southeastern College Art Conference meets April 25-26, at Louisiana U., Baton Rouge. Ralph Wickiser, Chairman, Department of Art, is host.

MASSACHUSETTS

BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL

The Bureau of University Travel is offering a free trip to Europe either for the coming summer or the summer of 1953 to any representative, promising student, or junior instructor, who secures 9 persons for any of the Bureau tours. Four registrations would entitle the representative to a trip at half-price. Further details may be secured from Mr. William M. Barber, Business Manager of the Bureau, 11 Boyd Street, Newton, Mass.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, Fogg Art Museum

"Aspects Incorporated: A Seventeenth-Century Firearm," on view at the Fogg from March 31 to April 26, is one of a series of small exhibitions arranged by the students in the Museum Course at the Fogg Museum every spring. The

central object in this exhibition is examined from six divergent points of view; 1) stylistically, 2) through the discovery of the original sources used by the artists for their inspiration or designs, 3) by attribution through comparison, 4) genealogically through Heraldry, 5) by identification of similar weapons in contemporary hunting scenes, and 6) historically in the evolution of firearms. To the museum visitor the exhibition infers the question "Is there an approach that appeals to you?" The show is the work of Richard H. Randall, Jr. of Baltimore, Maryland. Another exhibition, entitled "*Color Print-Making*" was arranged by a graduate student, Carroll E. Hogan, and stresses contemporary expression and interpretation by artists in a wide variety of media.

MICHIGAN

DETROIT INSTITUTE OF ARTS

Dedicated to the *Crusade for Freedom*, America's first comprehensive exhibition of the art of the Ming Dynasty is being presented by the Detroit Institute of Arts from April 18 through June 1. More than 300 objects have been chosen to recreate the atmosphere of the period. Major museums in America and Canada have contributed to the exhibition which was organized by Paul L. Grigaut, Associate Curator of the Detroit Institute.

THE GRAND RAPIDS ART GALLERY

During February and March, Dr. Jane B. Welling, formerly Chairman of the Art Education Department, Wayne University, gave a series of four lectures on "The Art of Our Time."

NEW JERSEY

RUTGERS

The gift of three original paintings to Rutgers University as part of the Jack Kriendler Memorial Collection was announced recently by Dr. Helmut von

Erfa, Chairman of the Art Department. The paintings, donated by Victor Riesenfeld, New York business executive and artist, include two studies by Mane-Katz and one by Pearl Fine, Boston abstractionist.

NEW YORK STATE

COLGATE UNIVERSITY

A special loan exhibition of "Painting and Sculpture by Artists of Central New York" was held at Colgate University's Lawrence Hall, February 14 to March 5. Among the exhibitors were Paul Parker, Chairman of the Department of Art at Hamilton College; Edward Christiana, Jason Schoener, and Joseph Trovato, artists of the Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute; and John Hartell, Chairman of the Department of Painting and Sculpture at Cornell University.

HOFSTRA COLLEGE

The 1952 "Long Island Artists Exhibition" sponsored annually by Hofstra College was held at Memorial Hall, March 24 to April 5. The Jury consisted of Malcolm Preston, John F. Hopkins and Frank Kleinholz of the Fine Arts Department, and William D. Hull of the English faculty. The paintings and drawings of Ralston Crawford were on exhibition for two weeks in February. Crawford spoke at the college on February 21.

MUNSON-WILLIAMS-PROCTOR INSTITUTE

On exhibition of oil paintings by William Palmer, Director of the M-W-P School of Art, was on view at the Midtown Galleries in New York, January 8 to February 2.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

On March 17, the School of Art opened an exhibition of paintings by the distinguished contemporary artists, Marc Chagall and Rufino Tamayo. With the closing of this exhibition the School of Art will move its gallery activities and

its offices to the new Joe and Emily Lowe Art Center. The new center will provide exhibition galleries, studios, lecture halls, a lithography room, and administrative offices. The building was designed by the architectural firm of Lorimer Rich and Robbins Conn, and Harry A. and F. Curtis King, University architects. The \$300,000 structure is the gift of Mr. & Mrs. Lowe. Syracuse will conduct the sixth annual summer session of the Mexican Art Workshop in Taxco, Mexico, from July 10 to August 14, 1952. Painting, Spanish, and silvercraft courses will be given by faculty members in association with Mexican instructors. Professor Frank Kent, School of Art, Syracuse University, acts as Director. Both graduate and undergraduate credits are available. Mexican lecturers include Carlos Mérida, Juan O'Gorman, Justino Fernández and William Spratling. Information can be obtained from Robert S. McDowell, Director of Extension Programs, Syracuse, N.Y., or from Irma S. Jonas, Administrator, 238 East 23 St., New York 10, N.Y.

NEW YORK CITY

ART RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Art Research Associates, an agency designed to offer specialized research in the art field, has been organized in New York by a group of free-lance researchers, headed by Virginia Marshall and Elizabeth Morrison. One activity of Art Research Associates is to make New York's research facilities available to out-of-town clients. Inquiries should be addressed to Art Research Associates, 40 East 52nd St., New York 22, N.Y.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

This spring, City College Extension Division is presenting two series of six 15-minute broadcasts on "How Parents and Children Can Work Together in Arts and Crafts" and "You and Your Home." The programs, in the form of lectures, forums and interviews, are

heard on Tuesdays from 11:30 to 11:45 A.M. The first six, dealing with arts and crafts for parents and children, were based on the work done in the Extension Division's "Parent-Child classes" and were presented by the following lecturers: I. E. Levine, Simon Lissim, Mary Worley Johnson, and Nordia Prietz Kay.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Dr. Paul S. Wingert is currently visiting the islands of the South Pacific on a Viking Fund grant to complete studies that will lead to a major exhibition of Pacific Island Art at the Portland Art Museum.

THE COOPERATIVE BUREAU FOR TEACHERS

The Cooperative Bureau for Teachers has arranged for air transportation for its members to and from Europe this summer. The flights are on planes chartered from BOAC and KLM. Questions should be addressed to The Cooperative Bureau for Teachers, 1776 Broadway, New York 19, N.Y.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Seven young artists from five continents arrived in New York in February on a cultural exchange project sponsored by the Institute. They are members of the International Arts Project, financed by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The young people will be in the U. S. for three months visiting all across the country. The purpose of the project is to help increase knowledge and understanding of American culture in other parts of the world. Two members of the group are artists—Miss Maria Mendoza, painter and sculptress from Peru, and Douglas Portway, painter from South Africa. Chosen in each country by a competition held by a national professional nominating committee, the artists were finally selected by an advisory committee of prominent Americans. The art committee was composed of Theodore Brenson of Artists Equity Association;

Sterling Callisen, Dean of Education, Metropolitan Museum of Art; and Stewart Klonis, Executive Director, Art Students League. This is the second of three such delegations that make up the total "1952 International Arts Program" of the Institute of International Education.

THE HALLMARK ART AWARD

A second international Hallmark Art Award competition has been announced with \$12,500 in prizes for the best water color paintings on Christmas themes submitted by artists of North, Central and South America and Western Europe. The Wildenstein Galleries will administer the contest through its art galleries in New York, Paris, London and Buenos Aires. Entry blanks may be obtained from Mr. Vladimir Visson, Director, The Hallmark Art Award, Wildenstein & Co., Inc., 19 East 64th St., New York 21, N.Y.

THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART

The Metropolitan is sponsoring a second free evening lecture series, "Enjoying Painting II—Fourteen Famous Artists." The lectures, on Tuesdays at 8:00 P.M., are being given by Margaretta M. Salinger, Senior Research Fellow, Department of Paintings, and will continue through May 6.

Three fellowships for graduate study at the Metropolitan Museum next year were awarded to Rebecca C. Wood, M.A. (Bryn Mawr, 1950), Lawrence Majewski (Yale), and Richard H. Randall, Jr., Princeton, 1950, and Harvard M.A. 1951. Established a year ago, the Metropolitan Museum fellowships are designed to enable outstanding graduate students to further their education in preparing for careers in scholarship or museum work. They will receive \$3,000 to enable them to carry on a year's intensive study in one or more departments of the Museum. If their work has been satisfactory, they then will be eligible for an additional \$1,000 to cover a minimum of two months' study abroad.

MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

On March 11, a symposium, "De Divina Proportione" was held at the Museum of Modern Art. George Howe, Department of Architecture, Yale University; Eero Saarinen, architect; Dr. W. B. Dinsmoor, Professor of Art, Columbia University; and Enrico Peressutti, Italian architect, took part in this discussion of the theories of proportion in art. José Luis Sert, President of the International Congress of Modern Architects, acted as moderator. A symposium on "The Film Approach to Art" was conducted by a panel of art historians, film experts and users of art films, on April 8.

NEW YORK MUSEUMS COMMITTEE

During the week of January 26 through 31, leading stores on Fifth Avenue and 57th Street turned over more than 100 show windows for a series of related exhibits, "World on View." The exhibits were staged to mark the Third National Conference for Unesco. Under the auspices of the New York Museums Committee for the Conference, the exhibits represented the combined efforts of thirty city museums whose interests range from art to zoology, and offered a token demonstration of the role played by museums in community life.

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

The library is celebrating the Tenth Anniversary Year of its Art Education Program under the direction of Mr. Simon Lissim. A series of lectures by top-ranking artists and a group of workshop courses in design have been presented annually by the New York Public Library since 1942. This year's art lectures will continue through May.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

This semester the State University Extension Division is offering evening and Saturday morning courses in Commercial Art and Photography at its New

York City unit, the Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, 300 Pearl St., Brooklyn. There are no specific prerequisites for admission to these classes. All students are eligible to work toward the Institute Certificate in this field.

WITTENBORN, SCHULTZ, INC.

The Wittenborn, Schultz art publication, "Modern Artists in America," previously announced under the title "Modern Art Annual," will be published in April. This first volume will contain lists of exhibitions of artists in New York galleries 1949-50, museums' acquisitions, a calendar of events in the art world and an international bibliography, as well as condensed transcripts of the "Western Round Table Discussion on Modern Art," held in San Francisco, and the "Artists' Sessions at Studio 35," held in New York.

NEBRASKA

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

The University of Nebraska Department of Art held its 1952 faculty exhibition during January. Also held this winter was a one-man show of the work of Walter Meigs, Assistant Professor of Art.

OHIO

CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM

The museum is presenting through April 25, its "Second International Biennial Exhibition of Contemporary Color Lithography" assembled by Gustave von Groschwitz, Curator of Prints in Cincinnati, over the full two-year period since the First Biennial in 1950.

CLEVELAND INSTITUTE OF ART

This year's annual Student Independent Show, composed of work done by students outside regular class assignments, drew 550 entries of which 250 were chosen by the jury for exhibition. \$650 in prizes were awarded in a number of

different categories by a jury of predominantly outside non-faculty artists. Carl Gaertner was awarded the \$1,200 Altman Prize at the New York National Academy of Design Show. Paintings by John Teyral and Peter Dudaniewicz were recently acquired by the Montclair Museum (New Jersey) and the Nelson Gallery of Art (Kansas City) respectively. Karl Zerbe of the Boston Museum School spent the week of February 18th here for lectures and consultations.

OBERLIN COLLEGE

An exhibition of eighteen Italian paintings of the 17th century were on view in the Allen Art Museum, Oberlin, from February 8 through February 29. The Winter issue of the Museum's Bulletin was an illustrated catalogue of the exhibition, with a foreword by Museum Director Charles P. Parkhurst, and a description of the exhibition by Professor Wolfgang Stechow. A group of 17 Chinese paintings, on loan from the Princeton Art Museum, was shown at the Museum during March.

OREGON

PORTLAND ART MUSEUM

Marion Ross, Assistant Professor of Architecture at the University of Oregon, gave a lecture on February 20, in the Museum auditorium. The lecture, arranged in connection with "Portland Architecture, 1860-1890," a current exhibition, dealt with architecture of that period on the national scene, and related the Portland structures to this context.

PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Architecture and Town Planning in Colonial Connecticut" by Anthony Garvan, published by the Yale University Press, has been awarded the annual gold medal of the Society of Architectural Historians as the outstanding contribution to architectural history by an

American author in 1951. Mr. Garvan is associate professor of American Civilization at the University of Pennsylvania and editor of the *American Quarterly*. His book is the latest volume in the Yale Historical Publications, a series now in its fortieth year.

VIRGINIA

MARY BALDWIN COLLEGE

A recent auction of students' work, held to raise money for the purchase of a painting for the College's permanent art collection, was so successful that contributing artists received shares of the proceeds.

VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE

Walter A. Simon, professor of art, has been selected by the American Friends Service Committee as a Visiting Lecturer for the academic year 1951-1952.

WILLIAM AND MARY

Carl Roseberg, sculptor on the faculty of William and Mary, now a Lt. Commander, USNR, was on his way to Japan and Korea when the plane in which he was a passenger crashed on Johnston Island while landing. He suffered first and second degree burns, but fortunately no permanent injury. An exhibition of "Old Virginia Architecture" was held January 8 to 21.

WASHINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Henry Gallery of the University of Washington began its fourteenth series of "Films in Your Gallery" on January 16. There are five showings of the films each Wednesday, March 2 to 23, "A Centennial Ceramic Exhibition" was presented by the Seattle Clay Club and the Henry Gallery. This juried exhibition included the work of Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho and British Columbia craftsmen in ceramics and ceramic sculpture. On April 2, 9 and 16 the University co-sponsored with the

Seattle Art Museum a series of lectures by Dr. Pal Kelemen on "Masterpieces of pre-Columbian Art," "Colonial Art in Latin America," and "Art History for Americans."

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

The University announces its Eighth Annual Institute in the Preservation and Administration of Archives, June 16 to July 11, 1952. For further information address Office of the Director, The American University, School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, 1901 F Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

THE CORCORAN SCHOOL OF ART

Richard Lahey, Principal of the Corcoran School of Art, announces the appointment of Byron Browne of New York City as a teacher in the Summer School, which is in session from June 3 through July 28, 1952. Mr. Browne has been teaching in the regular sessions of The Art Students League of New York.

FOREIGN NEWS

FRANCE

BARBIZON

Aimee Crane, former editor of the Hyperion Press, will conduct a summer art work-shop for American girls at her home in Barbizon, France. The work-shop will run from May 15 to October 15. Pupils may enter at any time for a six weeks' session. For further information write Aimee Crane, 30 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York.

PARIS

A festival called "Masterpieces of the Twentieth Century" will be held in Paris through the month of May, 1952, under the sponsorship of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. As part of the program, an exhibition of painting and sculpture is planned under the direction

of James Johnson Sweeney and Rene Huyghe. Mr. Sweeney will select masterworks of the contemporary period gathered from private collections and museums in the United States, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, France and England.

ITALY

VENICE

A retrospective exhibition of the graphic art of Henri de Toulouse Lautrec, whose 50th death anniversary fell on September 9, 1951, will form part of the XXVI Biennale di Venezia. It will consist of over 350 engravings, lithographs, drawings, designs for placards, book covers, etc., belonging to the American collector Ludwig Charoll. An extensive retrospective exhibition of the paintings of Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot (1796-1875) will also be among the retrospective exhibitions dedicated to the work of masters of modern painting at the coming Biennale. Germain Bazin, Conservateur of the Louvre Museum, is preparing the Corot exhibition.

ACLS ANNUAL MEETING

The American Council of Learned Societies held its annual meeting on January 23-24, 1952 at Rye, New York. The College Art Association was represented at the Secretaries' meeting by Rensselaer W. Lee, and at the Delegates' meeting by George Kubler.

In his annual report the Executive Director, Charles E. Odegaard, observed that the social sciences and the humanities had drifted apart in recent years. The social sciences are well supported in their scholarly activities, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to find backing for humanistic studies. Mr. Odegaard stated that if the Council was to discharge its obligations properly, it needed more lively interest and support from the member societies. In turn, the Council continues to offer many services and facilities to the member societies.

These may be summarized as 1) services of technical advice on publication matters; 2) training and study opportunities, such as Faculty Study Fellowships, Advanced Graduate Fellowships, First-year Graduate Fellowships, and the ACLS Scholars; 3) planning and developing new fields of study, such as the Near Eastern program; and 4) demonstrating the utility of humanistic studies to the national welfare. Finally Mr. Odegard noted that national policy in all fields continues to overlook the actual and potential contributions of the humanistic professions.

The reports from the Committees and from various ACLS projects indicate the range of the Council's activities: American Civilization; Far Eastern Studies; Near Eastern Studies; Southern Asia Studies; History of Religions; Humanistic Aspects of Science; Language Program; Musicology; Renaissance Studies; Recovery of Archaeological Remains; and Slavic Studies.

Throughout the meeting a recurrent theme of discussion was the alarming lack of popular understanding for humanistic studies. The delegates and the officers of the Council commented repeatedly upon the ineffectiveness of humanistic teaching in the colleges, and upon the indifference of the great public to humanistic publications. It was urged upon the delegates that they remind their memberships of the urgent need to make humanistic studies intelligible and important to a larger number of people in the country at large.

ACLS SCHOLARS

The ACLS announces for the academic year 1952-53 a program of awards for individuals to be designated ACLS

SCHOLARS, to be carefully chosen from teachers in the humanities temporarily displaced from college and university faculties as a result of the defense emergency. Applications will be received from individual candidates, although the ACLS will welcome nominations from academic institutions. In any case, the ACLS will ask the institution with which the candidate has been associated for an expression of its concern and its interest in his academic future. Application forms should be requested immediately from the Secretary for ACLS SCHOLARS, American Council of Learned Societies, 1219 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

FULBRIGHT AWARDS

For information on U. S. Government Grants, under auspices of the Department of State and Board of Foreign Scholarships (Public Law 584, 79th Congress) apply to Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D.C. Graduate students desiring to enroll for courses abroad or to pursue a directed program of studies at the pre-doctoral level should apply to their local Fulbright Program Advisers or directly to the Institute of International Education in New York City, before October 1952.

NEW C.A.J. COVER

Many inquiries and favorable comments have been received regarding the new cover of the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL. It was designed by Viktor Schreckengost, well known Cleveland ceramist, painter and industrial designer.

Letters to the Editor

Professor Frey's article, *Humanist Sculpture or Meaningless Decoration* (C.A.J., XI, 2, p. 66) invites comment both on the level of the question raised and on the level of the manner of raising it.

On the level of manner, the article contains notions and expressions that make it difficult for the reader to reach the essence of Mr. Frey's question. To mention but a few of these, Mr. Frey's Humanism appears to be his label for concepts developed by historians who have been inspired mainly by Graeco-Roman and Renaissance Art. Regarding Mr. Frey's statement that "generally he (man) has never started a new period without using and respecting the Humanist tradition," it would seem to me that, in Greece and Europe at least, humanism was an end product and not the beginning. The beginning in both cases resembles what Mr. Frey calls meaningless decoration. The meaning of Mr. Frey's "meaning" also has not become clear to this reader. I am unable to understand, for instance, what Mr. Frey means by "style" when he accepts modern art "if by that term one refers to a change in style."

I can not follow Mr. Frey in his assertion that "we have no difficulty in accepting and understanding the sculpture of the Mayan, Chinese, Greek, and many others." I, for one, did not begin to understand Egyptian sculpture before I visited the Nile valley, and I have only a vague notion of what many other groups of sculpture want to say, other than that they use the image of man as one of their vehicles of communication. Mr. Frey's polarity of spirit and function contradicts the convergence of physicists', psychologists', and artists' insights as witnessed by Eddington, Mumford, Whyte, Bateson, and others.

His "mechanized approach to sculpture" seems to suggest that a sculptor can approach his work by other than human means, which is difficult to imagine. Judgments concerning an artist's intentions, such as "meaningless," cannot be passed on a sculptor's "expressions"—but relate to communication. Communication involves at least two people, and if it does not take place the persons involved are in no position to pass objective judgment.

Mr. Frey's contention that only human and animal shapes are adequate for the expression of "spiritual purposes" approaches the core of his question. May I ask why one should exclude the vegetable and mineral kingdoms, the vehicles for visual statements suggested by microscopic and telescopic vision and by the conceptions of modern physics? I am not certain that the invention of the mechanical clock or of the theory of relativity is less human than the creation of a baby; or that the blossoming of a flower is less miraculous than a smile on a man's face. Judging by my own experience, artists are trying to speak of what they feel to be the vital issues of their time; they are also trying to find symbols able to carry their message. I agree with Mr. Frey in that it is difficult to understand a message not clearly related to one's own framework of values. Also, I am not defending modern sculpture in all of its manifestations which, for purposes of communication, may often seem too private or too sketchy. But it would seem to me that the answer to the difficulty of communication cannot be found by proclaiming standards concerning the propriety of techniques and symbols which, unprepared as we are for the task at this moment, would exclude much that is essential to the emerging contemporary conception of reality. The

answer to this difficulty—and to Mr. Frey's question—will be found by enlarging the scope of Humanism beyond the definitions which Mr. Frey implies so that it will include all of nature as well as all of man's accomplishments.

ERNEST MUNDT, Director,
California School of Fine Arts
San Francisco, California

February 20th, 1952

Some time ago a West Coast columnist reported a rumor that various local organizations were about to win their demands for destruction of one of America's outstanding works of mural decoration. This is the monumental series of murals by Anton Refregier, completed several years ago in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, California, under the program of the Treasury Department's Section of Painting and Sculpture. These paintings, for which the artist was paid \$27,000.00 have been widely acclaimed. According to standard procedure, the murals were checked at several stages of production, and corrections were made by the artist as requested. Final payment signified complete acceptance by the Government of these works.

A committee of officers of Artists Equity's local chapter examined the murals to investigate the criticisms that were rumored as reasons for the attack. They found "that as of that date (Nov. 12, 1951) and probably for quite some time previously, the allegations were not true." The chapter feels that "some of the allegations were never true and that the others had all been corrected before the Government accepted the paintings as satisfactory."

Under date of Nov. 21, 1951, W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings (Public Buildings Service, Washington 25, D.C.) stated "no decision has been made with respect to the controversial question of the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office"; and

thus far he has supplied no information as to the nature of the charges nor the basis on which they were entertained.

Artists Equity feels that monumental works of art are important expressions of our living culture, and must not be subject to this type of attack. Failure to defend these works will lead to attacks on others, and the respect due artistic expression will fall to a new low, subjecting American culture to the ridicule of the entire world.

Recently, this organization passed the following resolution, establishing its position on the inviolability of monumental work:

"Whereas monumental works of painting or sculpture are peculiarly vulnerable because each example thereof is unique; and whereas, the destruction of such a work of art can obliterate in a day the fruits of an artist's best years; and whereas such destruction entails equally destructive consequences to the artist's economic status and professional reputation;

Therefore, it is resolved that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION condemns unconditionally the conscious destruction of works of art, whether painting or sculpture, and whether by private or government agency, that recompense to the artist cannot be considered payment for such destruction, and that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION shall oppose such destruction at all times through all means at its disposal."

We would like your organization to join us in enunciating a similar policy so that we may all work together for the protection of important examples of American culture.

Right now, we feel it would be valuable for Commissioner Reynolds to have your opinion on the case of the Refregier murals. The matter is rather urgent, for if an unfavorable decision is made, it could be carried out overnight by a man with a bucket of paint!

HENRY BILLINGS

President, Artists Equity Association

13 February 1952

Miss Ardelia Hall
Arts and Monuments Officer
Department of State
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Miss Hall:

At its annual meeting, held in New York City on January 26, 1952, the membership of the College Art Association empowered its Executive Committee to write you an expression of approval for your efforts in behalf of the restitution to rightful owners of works of art looted by the Nazis during the years 1933-1945 and found at the end of the war in American occupation zones.

The membership notes with appreciation that you are largely responsible for the fact that this important work, begun in June 1945 by the U. S. Army, was brought to completion in August 1951 by the Department of State. You were successful in blocking threatened curtailments of this program, and thus insured a proper termination to a cultural enterprise without historical precedent.

The College Art Association warmly supports the basic intentions of this six-year program, and congratulates you on your work in seeing it through.

Sincerely,

S. LANE FAISON, JR.

President, College Art Association

Book Reviews

Martin L. Wolf, *Dictionary of the Arts*, with an Introduction by Eric Partridge, xvi + 797 pp., New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$10.00.

Eric Partridge's introduction is persuasive, but the utility of this *Dictionary of the Arts* remains doubtful. The scholar needs more precise definitions than are offered, to point up his own accuracy of usage. The layman, whose needs might be fulfilled by less precision, requires a consistent presentation of terms not in his normal vocabulary, combined, it is to be hoped, with no lowered standard of correctness. It is difficult to decide what reader or type of reader needs a reference book defining both KHADOO ("a term in Hindu music") and PASHIM ("extremely soft, downy wool growing close to the body of a goat"); both HANDKERCHIEF DANCE ("a Bohemian folk-dance") and CHAMBER ("a space enclosed by walls and ceiling; a room"); but not, let us say, PHOTOSTAT, TYPOLOGY, TRECENTO, or ROOF-TREE.

Nevertheless, Mr. Wolf's *Dictionary of the Arts* provides much information and considerable entertainment. It can, I think, be more pleasantly read, than profitably consulted. One would not willingly omit learning, for example, that SWARFS are often used as FLITTERS. It is with a rather qualified admiration for the wide range of the editor's research that the following remarks on particular aspects of the book are made.

Matters of Fact. The definitions which generalize about art eras are usually inadequate if not actually misleading. "ANTIQUE . . . refers to the ages of flourishing art in Greece and Rome, preceding the Middle Ages (q.v.);" "LEADEN AGE" (to which the reader is referred from DARK AGE) is "the period between the death of Charlemagne and the accession of Hughes Capet;" "ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE" (other Romanesque arts are not mentioned) is "the revival of the Roman construction principles in the 11th and

12th centuries, characterized by the disappearance of the basilica style. . . . The site of this development was eastern Europe after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, and it spread gradually westward thereafter;" "BAROQUE" is "the art and architecture style prevailing from about 1600 to 1720 . . . Michelangelo, with gentle elegance, led the movement." Particular works of art do not fare much better. It is strangely unfair to the Parthenon pediments and metopes to call the Elgin Marbles "a part of the frieze executed"—was it?—"by Phidias in the construction of the famous Parthenon (5th century B.C.), now in the British Museum." The mosaics of S. Sophia are described as though entirely hidden from 1453 to 1932, and one learns too that they are "sometimes referred to as the *Byzantine Mosaics*." Technical processes are more adequately treated, being generally well enough defined despite the necessary condensation. Collotype, however, is decidedly not "a well-known but practically obsolete process in England, known in the U.S. as photo-gelatine."

Matters of Format. The book is printed and bound well. There are few typographical errors (but one appears under PROOF-READER). The dust jacket is in very poor taste. It is disappointing that cuts are used only as meaningless tail pieces and not to aid the text, since often a small diagram would save many words. The use of italics for purposes of cross-reference gives a curiously insistent effect, and, often, leads the reader to terms too general to be useful in his special quest: "ENGOBE—In *ceramics*, a coating of *slip* (q.v.), usually different in *color* from the body of the *pottery* object." Pronunciation or at least accent marks might have been useful, and more consistent etymological notations.

Inconsistencies. RHENISH SCHOOL appears, but not MOSAN. QUATTROCENTO and CINQUECENTO, but not DUGENTO or TRECENTO. MISSEL (sic), but not PSALTER or BREVIARY.

GNIEZNO DOOR, but not HILDESHEIM, VERONA, or NOVGOROD. RED-FIGURED VASES, but not BLACK-FIGURED or WHITE-GROUND.

Miscellaneous. Space is wasted by the duplication of information under two similar headings which "see" each other, as CROCHET and CROCKET, STOMP and STUMP. Some terms are defined in a single aspect instead of a multiple one; thus, PERSONIFICATION appears only as a literary term, and LIMOGES ENAMEL refers only to the painted enamel of the Renaissance. Other terms have misleading descriptions: MANDORLA is defined in part as "a soft light emanating from the figure," contrary to the representation in most medieval art; Y-CROSS, as "frequently seen as an engraved or etched ornament on chasubles."

It is, of course, almost impossible to review a dictionary in detail. My examples for specific criticism have been chosen with an art-historical bias. Reviewers in other fields may find that they can be more lenient with an editor who, although neither systematic nor scholarly as a lexicographer, has obviously taken pride and pleasure in marshalling his far-flung terms.

ROSALIE B. GREEN
Index of Christian Art
Princeton University

William Bell Dinamoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of its Historic Development*, Revised and Enlarged Edition based on the First Part of *The Architecture of Greece and Rome* by William J. Anderson and R. Phené Spiers, xxiv + 424 pp., 125 figs., 71 pl., London: B. T. Batsford, 1950. \$6.75.

When the Anderson-Spiers *Architecture of Greece and Rome* first appeared in 1902, it filled a great need for an English text on Classical Architecture. The revised work, split into separate volumes on Greek and Roman Architecture, which appeared in 1927, re-

flected the growing information and increased need for texts in each field. Dinsmoor's revision of the Greek section was far-reaching, almost a new book. The twenty-three years which have elapsed between the first revision and this new edition have seen an even greater accumulation of new information on Greek Architecture, much of it obtained through the efforts of Dinsmoor himself. With the knowledge acquired from forty years of excavation, research, publication and teaching, all connected with Greek architecture, no one is more competent than he to synthesize the subject. This new volume is certainly the most authentic and complete treatment of Greek Architecture in English, and probably in any language. Calling it a revision, however, fails to acknowledge the originality of Dinsmoor's contribution, for little but the seven-chapter scheme and scattered general paragraphs is left from the earlier editions. The new text is more than twice the length of Dinsmoor's first revision, because of much fuller treatment of the material contained in that edition and the addition of many buildings and classes of buildings either unknown in 1927 or not considered at that time.

This broadened interest is manifest already in the Introduction, for there are now added sections on the knowledge obtained from ancient authors, on which there is also a new section in the bibliography, on early travellers in Greece and early studies of Greek Architecture, on early excavations, on individual studies in the field and on reconstructions of ancient buildings. Throughout the text, too, this antiquarian interest has resulted in the addition of footnotes on the history of excavation of various sites or buildings, a matter always of interest in appraising the resulting information.

Only in Chapter One, The Aegean Age, is the reader confronted with a text essentially the same as that of 1927. There are almost no additions and few revisions, despite the fundamental changes in pre-history which have taken

place in the intervening years. The beginning of the Neolithic period is brought down from 8000 B.C. to 5000 B.C., but even this date should be lowered still another thousand years. The footnote on Aegean chronology on p. 3 lists no reference later than 1924, although subsequent revisions have been profound. In listing sites, only Dendra seems to have been added since 1927; many important ones are omitted. On the architectural side, it is discouraging to see the round-oval-rectangular theory of development of house plans appear in 1950. There is no evidence that circular houses antedate rectangular ones on the Greek mainland—the round houses of Orchomenus are now known to be Early Helladic, not Neolithic. There are separate traditions of round and rectangular plans which merge at times to give hybrid forms, or exist side by side, but the chronological documentation of the various types is against a round-oval-rectangular development either in Greece or elsewhere in the Near East. To consider the rectangular houses with buttresses at Tsangli the result of a spread of southern house types is to distort the archaeological evidence; they are much too early. On the other hand, it is gratifying to see Dinsmoor's rightful insistence, despite frequent objections, on gabled roofs for buildings of the megaron type and his rejection of the term "megaron" for such complexes as the Queen's Quarters at Knossos. The Eleusis megaron, the plan of a chamber tomb and the note on the dispersion of Achæan architecture to Ras Shamra are welcome additions.

Chapter Two, The Origins of Greek Architecture, is greatly revised and enlarged, beginning with new and more acceptable dates for the foundation of the colonies, and added paragraphs on the various archaeological periods from the Mycenaean through the Orientalizing, on the religious nature of early architecture, on primitive altars, and on many new early temples and models not previously known. Here also the

round
velop
it d
metric
proto
treat
broug
their
little
tectur
for th
out t
archit
vious
Howe
metric
shoul
additi
Siphn
Boeot
and I
ments
as the

In
velop
are tr
if an
deed,
sidera
of th
the b
follow
templ
well
tion
takes
very
precis
templ
the
whic

In
Style,
satisf
monu
whic
are r
small
altars
monu
influe
Th

round-oval-rectangular theory of development of temple plans appears, as it does again in connection with Geometric houses. Both the proto-Doric and proto-Ionic developments are very fully treated, with all possible evidence brought to bear to give a picture of their early stages. The addition of what little is known about non-religious architecture in this early period sets a pattern for the following chapters, for throughout the book the treatment of secular architecture is very full, whereas previously it had been rather summary. However, the list of sites at which Geometric houses have been found (p. 65) should be considerably increased, notable additions being Troy VIII, Lemnos, Siphnos, the Lasithi in Crete, Eretria, Boeotian Orchomenus, Aegina, Eleusis and Ithaka. Votive and sepulchral monuments also receive fuller discussion here, as they do in all later chapters.

In describing the sixth century development, Doric and Ionic architecture are treated separately, for they had little if any effect on one another and, indeed, flourished in separate areas. A considerable discussion on the development of the Doric order has been added at the beginning of chapter three, and there follows much new material on early temples on the Acropolis in Athens as well as in Italy and Sicily. The description of Doric temples to about 490 B.C. takes up most of this chapter, and is very complete. The section on temple precincts and the various adjuncts to temples is mostly new, and so also is the description of secular buildings which follows.

In discussing the Rise of the Ionic Style, in Chapter Four, there is the same satisfying completeness both in the monuments described and the detail with which they are treated. The buildings are mostly in Asia Minor, except for smaller monuments, such as treasuries, altars and stoas, votive and sepulchral monuments, which bring the first Ionic influence into the Greek mainland.

The mingling of Doric and Ionic

forms during the fifth century makes a separate treatment no longer possible, and both are discussed together in Chapter Five. Here Dinsmoor's own investigations have added greatly to our knowledge of the buildings on the Athenian Akropolis, in the Agora below, at Sunium, Rhamnous, Bassae, Olympia, and as far as Sicily, and much new material is added both in the text and the illustrations, material scheduled to appear in larger studies, but most welcome now in condensed form. Among the numerous new illustrations, there is a plan of the Akropolis, but by contrast the very old views of it that are reprinted look out of place. Dinsmoor's new plan of the Propylaea, fig. 75, is confusing because, in the northeast wing especially, the hatching is too close and has printed almost black. It is surprising that in connection with the discussion of fifth century and later secular architecture, and of city planning, no plan of the Athenian Agora is given, though plenty are available and most of the individual buildings are mentioned. To the discussion of private houses must now be added that group of several houses found just southwest of the Agora in Athens, finally published in *Hesperia* too late for Dinsmoor's bibliography.

After the fall of Athens in 404 B.C., there was a decline in work on the Greek mainland and Asia Minor became the scene of the greatest activity. Chapter Six, The Beginning of the Decadence, covers the fourth century, treating both Doric and Ionic and the rise of the Corinthian style, invented only in the second half of the fifth century. If there are fewer and less interesting temples from this century, there is a compensating increase in the number and variety of secular buildings, which are fully treated. The section on the theater is especially detailed and there is a whole new section on houses, based largely on information from Olynthus. Dinsmoor's statement (p. 252) that "The house seems generally to have been of one storey" is contrary to that in *Olynthus*,

VIII, p. 214, to the effect that there is conclusive proof in the stairways of many houses of a second storey. The excavators have assumed that a second storey over at least the northern half of the houses was the general rule at Olynthus. Votive and sepulchral monuments receive a much fuller treatment and, again, a section on city planning is added to conclude the chapter.

The final chapter takes up the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman phases. It was a period which saw the virtual end of the Doric style and the triumph of the Corinthian order. The list of temples finished, rebuilt or newly founded during the period is large. It was a period in which the orders often merged or were used together in the same building. Here, again, the secular buildings are the more numerous and are well discussed. The theater in its new form is again fully described and there are new drawings of those at Eretria, Oropos and Priene, and of Vitruvius' scheme for both the Greek and Roman theater. Baths are treated here for the first time, having been only briefly mentioned before; the hot bath at Corinth, dated by Scranton to the fifth century, must now claim precedence over those at Oenidae.

The greatly increased and revised text is accompanied by similarly enlarged appendices and indices. New sites have been added to the maps of Italy and of Greece and Asia Minor. A table of metric measurements of temples is a most helpful addition; many of these measurements are Dinsmoor's own. Numerous dates in the Chronological List of Greek Temples have been changed, three more columns give added measurements, six temples have been added to the list of Doric monuments and two to that of Ionic temples. But it is the bibliography, now more than five times as large as that in the 1927 edition, which has seen the greatest expansion. The section on Ancient Sources is new, the fourteen others are all much larger than before and there is little literature

up to 1950 which is not listed. It will serve as the starting point for most bibliographies not only for detailed architectural studies but for those in allied fields as well. The Glossary is somewhat enlarged and the indices are much fuller than before. Fifty-five illustrations have been added to the 1927 list, nineteen of them from Dinsmoor's own drawings or photographs and most of these previously unpublished, and several of the old illustrations have been replaced by more up-to-date views. Unfortunately, the old illustrations which have been re-used have now almost uniformly lost much in quality and interest and are markedly inferior to the newly added photographic reproductions.

If this review is long and detailed, it is because the reviewer feels that this book will long remain the standard text on Greek Architecture. It has no rival in completeness and authenticity; its date, 1950, belies the fact that there is incorporated in the text much information which will not appear in other form for several years, and it will not soon be outdated. Students of the History of Architecture and of Archaeology will for long owe a great debt to Dinsmoor for this volume, as well as for the more specialized studies both published and promised.

SAUL S. WEINBERG
University of Missouri

Alexander Coburn Soper, *Kuo Jo-hsü's Experiences in Painting: An Eleventh Century History of Chinese Painting Together with the Chinese Text in Facsimile* (American Council of Learned Societies Studies in Chinese and Related Civilizations, No. 6), xiv + 216 pp., 1 ill., Washington: American Council of Learned Societies, 1951. \$6.00.

This translation of Kuo Jo-hsü's *T'ung Hua Chien Wen Chih* could be said to form a kind of supplement or completion to Mr. Soper's publication of the *T'ang Ch'ao Ming Hua Lu* in the *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of*

America for 1950. It continues the account of Chinese painting up until ca. 1070 A.D. To a certain extent the present text overlaps the content of the Tang history, so that we have further recordings of some of the great artistic personalities of the seventh and eighth centuries. Actually the present work is most valuable for its accounts of the artists of the immediate past, in the Five Dynasties Period, and the painters of Northern Sung times with whom the author could have been personally acquainted. Although it is doubtful if more than a handful of original paintings by the scores of artists enumerated by Kuo Jo-hsü survives to the present day, the writer's observations on the models and principles to be followed by painters of his day have a definite validity for our understanding of pictures by the masters of Northern Sung times and later.

Certain portions of Kuo's text were translated by Sirén in *The Chinese on the Art of Painting* (Peiping, 1936). The reader will find it illuminating to compare the two versions of the paragraph on "Spirit Consonance" on p. 15 in Soper and pp. 77-78 of Sirén: in every case the painstakingly accurate rendering by Soper is an improvement on the very general translation by Sirén. It is precisely as a result of the very careful rendering of each term as it occurs in the original that one gains the right impression that, for Kuo Jo-hsü, *ch'i yün* meant something corresponding to our conception of inherent genius or inspiration. In exactly the same way, a simultaneous reading of Soper (p. 16) and Sirén (pp. 75-80) "On the Virtues and Faults of Brushwork" shows the balance in favor of the former's scholarly translation over the "sight-reading" by Sirén.

Although through no fault of the translator the text is cluttered with the usual clichés regarding the sublimity, freedom, or spirit consonance of various shadowy personages, this book is an indispensable tool for every advanced student of Chinese art: there are certain

passages regarding the rules to be followed in painting various natural forms: rocks, trees, animals, and birds, that indicate very plainly what was meant by the "suitability of characterization" that bestows both forcefulness and aliveness to the painting. We gather that this was to depend upon the artist's knowledge and apprehension of the structure and articulation of various forms such as rocks and trees and, for the painting of birds, an ornithologist's knowledge of the architecture of feathered structure. Although there are certain passages in the literature of Northern Sung criticism—for example, the *Hua Chi*—that might lead one to believe that drawing from life—*hsieh sheng*—was the recognized practice, the term really means to draw from a lifelike manner; it implies the presentation of concepts on the basis of observation, absorption, and memory, rather than a direct recording from the model. Presumably the passages in Kuo Jo-hsü regarding drawing from nature imply this same creative ideation.

It is useless to complain of the dead wood in the shape of lists of vanished painters, quaint anecdotes, etc.; we should really be grateful for any crumbs that illuminate the traditions of ancient painting in China, especially when these fragments cast some light upon the originals surviving from this distant period. One might mention for example, Mr. Soper's translation of *tsun-tan* as "texture strokes," an admirable description of the method of piling up multiple small strokes of the brush, either stippled or dragged, to give at once the texture and formal rock formation in the landscapes attributed to Fan K'uan.

The footnotes to this translation, some 753 in number, provide a real mine of information inviting the reader's most diligent quarrying. Many of these notes provide a kind of glossary of the technical terms of Chinese painting, as, for example, the exposition in Note 127 of the interpretation of *p'o mo* as the technique of graduated washes. It

should be added that something should have been said in this note about the *p'o mo* written with different characters, which means literally "splash ink", and is descriptive of that wild and seemingly uncontrolled adumbration of shapes and textures from pools of flowing ink, as practiced especially by Ch'an and Taoist artists of Sung times and later.

There are a great many mentions throughout the text of the so-called "boneless" method, *mu ku hua*, as practiced by such now shadowy masters of bird-and-flower painting as Huang Ch'üan, Huang Chu-tsai, and Hsü Hsi, and no less frequent criticisms of this method as lacking in brushwork, ink, structure, and spirit. The boneless method, apparently, could mean one of two things: modeling in what is called in Western Mediaeval and Renaissance practice the "mode of relief," in which graduated washes of a given pigment, say crimson, with its highest intensity in shadow and gradually thinned to white in the highlights, serves to give not only the local color of an area but an entirely arbitrary illusion of relief. The other interpretation of the term came to mean simply painting without outline—the mere definition of shapes in terms of freely brushed areas of color without either outline or suggestion of modeling—a technique that may be seen in the work of Sung artists like Ma Lin, and was developed into a specialty by the Ch'ing flower painter, Yün Shou-p'ing.

There is every indication that the boneless method in its first interpretation was a foreign importation, as we may judge, for example, from its disparagement by later critics and from the descriptions of the paintings by the Six Dynasties artist, Chang Seng-yu, whose technique in creating the illusion of relief is described as a foreign manner. We gather that the method of painting flowers in order to create the illusion of their existence in relief was a derivation from the painting in the mode of relief that we can see universally in the Indian decorative panels at Ajantā and

in the adaptations of that manner in Central Asia. That this manner, essentially foreign to the Chinese conception of form in terms of defining outline in calligraphic brushstroke, gradually became an accepted part of the Far Eastern tradition may be divined not only from the frequent mentions of it in the pages of Kuo's treatise, but in the copies of lost paintings by the masters whom it discusses. The term, boneless painting, is brought up in connection with the work of the classic master of flower painting, Hsü Hsi. This artist is only one of a great many painters, such as Chang Seng-yu and Huang Ch'üan, who, according to Kuo Jo-hsü, are credited with the invention of this manner. From the many later copies attributed to Hsü Hsi we may gather that this technique, as far as he was concerned, meant a soft, graduated modeling in the local tone, which also serves to indicate the color of the particular flower to be painted. This is of particular interest in relation to an album-leaf of a peony exhibited in a recent showing of bird-and-flower paintings at the Fogg Art Museum. This album-leaf bears a label reading "boneless peony", which here presumably refers to the relief technique in which it was executed, rather than to a type of flower (cf. Soper, n. 524).

Of particular interest to all students of Chinese painting is the short paragraph (pp. 21-22) "On the Relative Superiority of Past and Present":

If one is speaking of Buddhist and Taoist subjects, secular figures, gentlewomen, or cattle and horses, then the modern do not come up to the ancient. If one is speaking of landscapes, woods and rocks, flowers and bamboo, or birds and fishes, then the ancient does not come up to the modern.

The implications of this paragraph and the further exposition which follows are that, as early as the eleventh century, certain standards of performance had come to be recognized as models that in a classic sense were already regarded

as providing a norm that could not be improved upon. In other words, in 1070, when Kuo Jo-hsü wrote, the figure style of Wu Tao-tze and Han Kan's method of drawing horses were models that every successive generation of artists was bound to follow. The quotation is no less interesting for the critic's recognition of the innovations taking place in the fields of landscape and bird-and-flower painting. With regard to landscape the author was apparently acquainted with the work of Li Ch'eng, Kuo Hsi, and Fan K'uan, who in all later histories are invariably mentioned as the real innovators in this genre, the pioneers in our modern conception of Chinese landscape painting.

The sections of this work selected for analysis by the present reviewer will, it is hoped, give an idea of how Mr. Soper's work can be useful. The book would obviously be totally bewildering to anyone beginning the study of Chinese painting, nor does it recommend itself as one to read from cover to cover, since, like all Chinese histories of art, it is a disjointed mass of anecdotes, reminiscences, personal opinions, and catalogues of artists' names and works. However, for the advanced student and specialist in the field who is looking for specific information on a given artist or a special technique, the book provides a very rich and welcome repository. Incorporated is a splendid facsimile of the Chinese text from the seventeenth-century Mao Chin edition.

BENJAMIN ROWLAND, JR.
Harvard University

George Kubler and Charles Gibson,
The Tovar Calendar: An Illustrated Mexican Manuscript ca. 1585 (Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XI), 82 pp., 14 pl., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. \$6.00.

A straightforward and thoroughgoing work of scholarship is always a satisfying and even astonishing thing. This publication of a Mexican manuscript

now in the John Carter Brown Library takes its place with the very few valuable commentaries on such source material; it is of cardinal importance for any anthropological or historical study of pre-Conquest and sixteenth-century culture in Mexico.

The study is brief and without ornament in statement, but its exploration of the implications of the material has a breadth and generosity which make it seem far more extensive than its 82 pages. Thus we are given the pages of the manuscript in facsimile; a transcript of the Spanish and Nahuatl text and a translation into English; a list of more than seventy other sources of information on the Mexican calendar, with analytical notes including dates, description, bibliography and a resumé of the complicated relationships between them; a translation of two letters between José de Acosta and Juan de Tovar which are included in the Providence manuscript; and a documented analysis of the pictorial form of the content of this calendar. This all amounts to a complete exposition of our understanding of calendrical problems in pre-Conquest Mexico. Finally a third section deals with queries arising from a study of the manuscript, and its larger implications in regard to not only the pre-Conquest chronology, but the cultural ambience of sixteenth-century Mexico.

It should be stressed, for those who will view this material as of rather restricted interest, that such a serious and (to use the term accurately) imaginative piece of scholarship can be of value to any thoughtful student—as a model of what such research problems demand, if for nothing else. In brief one would like to comment on (1) its mood of leisure and completeness, (2) the simple and uncompromising presentation of facts, and (3) a willingness to offer generalizations which are the fruit of an intelligent brooding over these facts. No work of scholarship can rank in the primary category without these two aspects—the intention of reporting

the facts so completely that others may use the publication in the same way they could the original, and the considered interpretation of these facts which is the individual's contribution to his material.

As non-professionals, we are especially grateful for the second aspect of the study. Thus the candid conclusion that pre-Conquest calendrical systems cannot be definitively correlated, not merely because our records are inadequate, but because Indian cultures actually lacked the systemization which everyone from the conquistadors down has tried to find in them, is of value far beyond the matter of this manuscript. Anyone who has worked with sixteenth-century problems in Latin America will recognize its significance as a warning against too rigid classification of a fluid and sporadic cultural environment. In the same way, any student of the colonial field must be interested in Kubler's comment that native culture was actually stimulated in certain aspects by contact with European modes—an observation which does much to upset the old dichotomy of Indian versus European. Other passages of interest to art historians deal with the already hybrid figural style of the illustrations, and with the mode of correlating Christian and pagan time-schemes and their symbols. On this latter subject, Kubler makes the point that the relationship of the scattered attributes of the time-period by conceptual links (rather than by the devices of pictorial illusion) is not exclusively an Indian method, but perhaps inherent in the nature of the material. He offers various illustrations from European medieval and Renaissance calendars in evidence that such time-space expression—for which "the 'block of time' is the space of the picture"—takes on some universal form. And although such a suggestion may be offensive to partisans of the Indian culture, it is an indication of the maturing of criticism in the Latin American field; our understanding of it cannot but be enriched by every effort to place it in the wide view of human art.

Some recognition of the larger validity of such a study seems to be implied in this publication by the Connecticut Historical Society of what might on the face of it seem an alien matter—an understanding on which the society is to be congratulated.

ELIZABETH WILDER WEISMANN
Lexington, Kentucky

Robert Bruce Inverarity, *Art of the Northwest Coast Indians*, xiv + 52 pp., 287 ill. (8 in color), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. \$10.00.

In a curiously divided fashion this book displays two radically contrasting aspects. As a compilation of pictorial material it has a certain competence and usefulness. But as text, dealing with the art and culture of the Northwest Coast Indians, it is, unfortunately, very disappointing.

The illustrations have been discriminatingly selected, attractively arranged and reproduced, using mostly unpublished examples. A conscientious system of "labels" greatly enhances the value of the plates by indicating tribal origin, date of collection, present location, museum number (!), and measurements of the objects. Such painstaking care, and the extreme caution in tribal attributions, show the author to be a methodical collector. He is in fact, a museum director (Museum of International Folk Art, Santa Fe, New Mexico), and has spent some twenty years in research among the Northwest tribes. Each illustration is further accompanied by a few sentences or paragraphs which contain a miscellany of technical, iconographic, ethnological, and aesthetic information. Thus far we may say that as a picture-book, designed for "the general public", it successfully fills the gap in an area of primitive art which is much less well known than it deserves.

The essential argument of the text is that an adequate grasp of the cultural context is essential to an understanding

of the
having
may be
tion
herald
author
ciple,
juxtap
to the
ing th
to the
The c
by thi
with,
upon.
appro
primit
short
"Cult
COLLI
pp. 3
mater
equip
which
of the
relate
least
sion o
exam
obvio
cernin
exam
disting
ties a
If our
captiv
in-the
"Echo
offers
made
of th
insigh
of th
bird,
The
lengt
wise
other
unde
refer
Wha
ning

of the art. This is no less true for having become trite. The genuine novice may be misled, from the urgent reiteration of this point, to believe that it heralds new principles. In any case the author does not himself apply the principle, unless it be by association, or juxtaposition. He gives three chapters to the culture and one to its art, relegating the matter of their mutual interaction to the level of superficial implication. The extraordinary possibilities afforded by this art for an integrated presentation with the culture are scarcely touched upon. In order to realize how such an approach can be successfully applied to primitive art, one need only read the short paper by Paul S. Wingert on "Cultural Motivations of an Artist," *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*, IX (1950), pp. 308-316. As descriptive background material the new book leaves us ill equipped to approach even the material which he illustrates. Just those aspects of the culture which are most vitally related to the use of the objects are least adequately presented. The discussion of secret societies and religion, for example, leaves us with only the most obvious and elementary information concerning the masks, of which some fifty examples are found in the plates. The distinctive forms and technical peculiarities of those masks remain unexplained. If our curiosity is aroused by the picture captions—which mention, "Man-burned-in-the-fire-dance", "fool dancers", and "Echo Mask" with six mouths—the text offers no satisfaction. Only scant use is made of the fact that the rich mythology of these tribes gives the most valuable insight possible for the comprehension of the wide range of meanings of their bird, fish, and animal representations. The author does recount one myth at length—that of the Raven—but otherwise we find only tantalizing hints of other, wonderful legends. The captions under figures only tease us by their casual reference to Thunderbird carrying the Whale, Sun and Bear, Wolf and Lightning Snake, Claw Men, the Cannibal of

the Mountains, etc. Eighteen rattles are reproduced among the figures, but slip by with little more than a word in the text. The reader would have no way of divining the considerable importance of the rattle in primitive ritual in general or the North Pacific tribes in particular. Certainly the more basic social traits and behavior patterns which are described—the "megalomaniac" self-glorification and the "morbid fear of ridicule"—must have had fundamental consequences in their art. But only a hint of this is given by way of parenthetical comment in the plates, to the effect that "the more segments the greater the prestige of the wearer."

Although the analysis of specific characteristics of the art contains some interesting and suggestive information, it remains undistinguished in its presentation. Witness, for example, the disparate headings which summarize the main characteristics of Northwest Coast art: "General style, Medium, Line, Color, Tones, Form, Texture, Organization, etc. . . ." The exposition under each of these headings treats isolated characteristics in no significant order of progression or development, intermingling Morellian details, technical data, and, occasionally, good stylistic observations. The typically infelicitous compounding of elements from different levels of analysis may be seen in the complete statement which appears under the heading of "General Style": "Northwest Coast art is exact, intellectualized, symbolical. It is predominantly symmetrical and curvilinear."

To discuss the chapter on art further would largely be a matter singling out further instances of disturbing inconsistencies and flaws, in principles, method, and terminology. The book is, nevertheless, sincere and enthusiastic, with little possible pretence in the disciplines of the history of art or cultural anthropology. This is rather touchingly evident in the bibliography. Here are found not only an excellent list of most pertinent literature, but also such less

necessary entries as Wölfflin's *Principles of Art History*, Croce's *Aesthetics*, Dewey's *Art as Experience*, and McMahon's *The Meaning of Art*. Some of the important items which may have escaped the author's notice are Clark Wissler's standard work on *The American Indian*, and Hartley B. Alexander's excellent *North American Mythology*. Since fig. 12 quotes at length from *Dyn*, there is some obligation to mention

(there, or in the bibliography) the particular reference (*Dyn*, 4-5, 1943, Amerindian Number, with article on "Totem Art" by Wolfgang Paalen). One final point, the absence of indices or tables is regrettable since they could have served toward efficient and orderly use of the most valuable part of this book, its illustrations.

HARRY BOBER
Harvard University

Books Received

Aldred, Cyril. *New Kingdom Art in Ancient Egypt: 1590-1315 B.C.* 98 pp., 174 ill. London: Alec Tiranti, 1951. 15 s.

Artistas Italianos de Hoje na la Bienal do Museo de Arte Moderna, de Sao Paulo, Brasil. 59 pp., many ill. Venezia: La Biennale, Ca' Giustinian, 1951.

The Arts and Philosophy: Autumn 1951, ed. Sidney Arnold. 55 pp. Essex: Arts and Philosophy, 1951. 3/6.

Barr, Alfred H., Jr. *Henri Matisse: His Art and His Public.* 591 pp., 23 color pl., 16 ill., 234 pp. of black and white pl. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1951. \$12.50.

Beenken, Hermann. *Rogier van der Weyden.* 236 pp., 135 ill. (4 in color). München: F. Bruckmann, 1951. 29 DM.

Bokser, Rabbi Ben Zion. *The Wisdom of the Talmud.* 180 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$3.75.

Firth, Raymond. *Elements of Social Organization.* 257 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$5.75.

Fox, Penelope. *Tutankhamun's Treasure.* 40 pp., 71 pl. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951. \$6.00.

Garvan, Anthony. *Architecture and Town Planning in Colonial Connecticut.* 166 pp., 72 ill. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. \$7.50.

Gaya Nuno, J. A. *El Escorial (Los Monumentos Cardinales de España, I).* Madrid: Editorial Plus Ultra, 1951. Ptas. 90.

Goldscheider, Ludwig, ed. *Michelangelo Drawings.* 58 pp., 130 pl., 200 ill. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951. \$8.50.

Hatzfeld, Helmut A. *Literature through Art: A New Approach to French Literature.* 247 pp., 100 ill. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. \$7.50.

Henry Moore: *Zeichnungen, Kleinplastik, Graphik. Ausstellung*, November-December 1951. 27 pp. Wien: Verlag Anton Schroll, 1951.

Lister, Raymond. *The British Miniature.* 114 pp., 68 ill. (2 in color). New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1951. \$7.50.



Henri Matisse, *Courtesy Wittenbern, Schultz, Inc.*

C

A

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

J